

Howard C. Huhn, Hamden.
Kathryn M. Diederich, North Ridgeville.
Grace L. Skidmore, West Mansfield.

PENNSYLVANIA

Chauncey D. Everard, Wapwallopen.

TENNESSEE

Hollis M. Caldwell, Lookout Mountain.
Roy B. King, Madison College.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

To be a captain

Graham H. Benson

To be second lieutenants

Lowell S. Reeve	Cleland E. Early
Allen H. Anderson	James M. Robinson
Elkin S. Dew	William R. Burgoyne, Jr.
Roscoe M. Nelson	Louis H. Wilson, Jr.
Walter J. Meyer	Maurice J. Kelly
Frank E. Hollar	William L. Flake
Thomas J. Myers, Jr.	Thomas F. Cave, Jr.
Owen P. Lillie	Vincent J. Gottschalk
Evan E. Lips	George A. Gililand
James W. Love	Cliff A. Jones, Jr.
George F. McInturf III	William R. Adams
Guy W. Comer, Jr.	Bryan B. Mitchell
John R. Kerman	John P. Storm
Francis L. Fagan	Rodney V. Reighard
Lincoln N. Holdzkorn	John B. Erickson
Charles R. Durfee	John N. McLaughlin
Thomas F. Mullahey, Jr.	Robert Mentzinger
William L. Culp	Charles E. Hinsdale
Charles F. Widdecke	Ralph Hornblower, Jr.
Valentine E. Diehl	William H. Enfield
John R. Lesick	James L. Denig
Richard Phillippi	John W. Bustard
Bruno J. Andruska	Maurice J. Coffey, Jr.
John G. Dibble	Joseph R. Clerou
William K. Crawford	Paul H. Groth

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Lord of lords and King of kings, we thank Thee that Thou dost come to us each day with light and life. Thy love is infinitely more than we can return and Thy revelation more than we can translate. Thou who looked with compassion upon a doomed city gray with the dust of silent centuries, show us the vision of Thy consecration and heroic purpose. Surrendering ourselves to Thy task may we with passionate ardor bow with penitent reverence before Thee, charting the journey of our souls from the cities of earth to the city of God. Bound and pressed by the tread of the thoughtless crowd, Oh bring us a message calling to higher states of power and blessing.

Thou, who didst come out of history's dawn, have mercy upon the multitude with its great heart, but with its greater ache. Let Thy holy word become flesh, O God, and dwell among us, living and working in deeds of Christian brotherhood. Like the fragrant springtime after a sore winter, heaven's light sheds calmness through starless skies. O Prince of Peace, come to the fallen ruins of our tragic world, transmuting them into forms of spiritual and intellectual might, beholding Thy glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and

truth. In the spirit of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2339. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the Allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5802. An act to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions; and

H. R. 6691. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement I made before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a press release from the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on this afternoon at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HIGH DEFENSE PROFITS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just noticed in the morning paper that Gen. Robert C. Richardson says that "boys in the Army were 'burned up' by reports that stenographers had been paid \$30,000 bonuses on defense jobs."

I think that the people of this country, especially the taxpayers who are going to have to pay the bill, as well as the fathers and mothers of the boys who are in the service, are pretty much disgusted to hear about the exorbitant profits that are being extorted by certain big defense contractors.

The company above mentioned, Jack & Heintz, Inc., who make airplane starters, and which company was also broke a year ago, paid its president \$145,000 salary and bonus and paid his private secretary \$39,300, and then distributed more than \$900,000 among 1,300 other officers and employees. Last month Mr. Jack admitted that he received a \$25,000 bonus. A dozen other big contractors, it has been discovered, received direct profits all the way from 40 to 75 percent on war contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I just do not see how those in authority and who are charged with making such contracts would permit a thing like that to get by. No wonder those soldiers are "burned up." The people of this country who have to pay the bill are disgusted and discouraged. This sort of thing must be stopped, and it must be done right now. Every one of these outfits who have taken the money ought to be made to return every dollar of it, and they should be penalized accordingly. Such individuals ought to have their contracts taken away from them. The Government should remove them and operate their plants.

Mr. Speaker, such a thing is shameful and disgraceful. It should not be tolerated. People who will do that sort of thing in a time when our Nation is in the most serious crisis it has ever known are not worthy to be regarded as citizens.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article from the Washington Post of March 25.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AWARD OF THE CAMP GRUBER POWER CONTRACT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, referring to a statement made on the floor yesterday by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] in regard to the award of a contract for the transmission and sale of power to Camp Gruber, in Oklahoma, for the RECORD I merely want to state, on the authority of General Reybold, the Chief of Engineers, the bid of the Grand River Dam Authority was not 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, but 7.5; and General Reybold has informed me that the contract was awarded by the War Production Board to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. for the very good reason of a severe shortage of copper, and by the award to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric copper was conserved.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6736, an act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does the gentleman have in mind? Will the gentleman agree, if there is no objection, to bring back any item for a separate vote in the House which I may request a separate vote on?

Mr. SNYDER. I would prefer that the gentleman state what those items might be.

Mr. POWERS. I have not looked over all of the Senate amendments, but there are two items that the House definitely voted down: One was Bull Shoals and the other was Table Rock. I certainly want to get an agreement from the gentleman to get a separate vote on these two items.

Mr. SNYDER. I will agree with the gentleman to bring those two back for a separate vote.

Mr. POWERS. If there is any other item that I have not seen as yet that I think requires a separate vote, will the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. SNYDER. There are only five amendments and they are all rather minor.

Mr. POWERS. Apparently the gentleman wants me to object; therefore, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include extracts from an article in the Saturday Evening Post; also from a bill, H. R. 6847.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INCREASING DEBT LIMIT OF UNITED STATES AND FURTHER AMENDING THE SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6691) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6691) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
THOS. H. CULLEN,
JERE COOPER,
FRANK CROWTHER,
HAROLD KNUXTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
HARRY F. BYRD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6691) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 2 of the House bill amended section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act by increasing the face amount of obligations issued under such act from \$65,000,000,000 to \$125,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The Senate amendment increased such amount to \$130,000,000,000 and included in the aggregate of obligations outstanding at any one time the face amount of all obligations issued by any agency or instrumentality of the United States which are unconditionally guaranteed as to the principal and interest by the United States, except such guaranteed obligations which are owned by the Treasury Department. The Senate recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
THOS. H. CULLEN,
JERE COOPER,
FRANK CROWTHER,
HAROLD KNUXTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As I understand it, the Senate put in an amendment increasing the amount that we would be permitted to raise the national debt from \$125,-

000,000,000 to \$130,000,000,000, with the understanding that they would add all the obligations of our country to be included in those debts which we were supposed to pay. Now, if we cut this down to \$125,000,000,000, will all the obligations of the United States, direct and indirect, be included in our national debt?

Mr. COOPER. There is a provision in the bill as it passed the House which the Committee on Ways and Means and the Treasury Department feel amply takes care of that situation. The bill passed the House authorizing a debt limit of \$125,000,000,000. The Senate increased that to \$130,000,000,000. In conference the Senate receded on the Senate amendment, so that the bill now comes back under the conference report just as it passed the House.

Mr. RICH. I would like to have this information, if I may. Will the indirect obligations of our Government, which I understood it was the intent and purpose of the increase of \$5,000,000,000, be included in the Treasury statement when we reach our debt limit of \$125,000,000,000?

Mr. COOPER. It is my understanding that it is the intention that the obligations as to which the interest and principal is guaranteed by the Government will be shown on the Treasury statement.

Mr. RICH. I think that was a wise provision that the Senate put in there, requiring that to be done.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request with reference to H. R. 6736, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill. I have had a conversation with the gentleman from New Jersey, and it may be that he will withdraw his objection on the basis of our conversation.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. So that we will have an absolute agreement, I understand the Bull Shoals and Table Rock and a \$3,700,000 item are included in Senate amendment No. 2?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. May I ask the gentleman whether he will bring Senate amendment No. 2 back to the House for a separate vote?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. That is agreeable to the gentleman?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I am not going to object as long as the gentleman agrees to bring those two items, Table Rock and Bull Shoals, for a separate vote.

Let it be known that the Senate report does not show the justification for reinstating the objectionable items committing the Government to a \$87,500,000 project, nor does the debate in the Senate show it. The bill passed the Senate yesterday just as fast as the clerk could read the amendments. It did not take more than a column in the RECORD. There was no debate in the Senate, not a paragraph. Those who preach economy can save money by watching such proposals as these. We should have an opportunity to debate the question again and get a separate vote. As long as the gentleman says he will give us a separate vote, I withdraw my reservation of objection, but I am going to insist on a roll call when the conference report comes back if it is necessary.

Mr. TERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, under this agreement there will be a separate vote on each of these two projects, Table Rock and Bull Shoals?

Mr. POWERS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand they are all in one amendment, Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, are we to understand from the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we are going to have a vote on these two items at one time, or will we have a vote on them separately?

Mr. SNYDER. They will have to be brought back as one amendment.

Mr. RICH. Did the Senate consider the fact that these two projects have not been started and that additional funds must be found some place by the taxpayers of this country before they can be started?

Mr. TERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did not the Senate also find that the engineers had testified over there in the hearings that these projects are very essential for the production of electric power, which is needed in the war effort?

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman from Arkansas what year it was determined this power would be available?

Mr. TERRY. During the time the war will be going on, in all probability.

Mr. RICH. This war or the next war? Mr. TERRY. The war in which we are now engaged, and which the gentleman evidently does not know about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SNYDER, TERRY, STARNES of Alabama, COLLINS, KERR, MAHON, POWERS, ENGEL, and CASE of South Dakota.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute for the purpose of entering a protest against the possibility of taking a recess or vacation at this time. I understand plans are under way for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I have made an investigation of some of the bills pending and I think we have a great many bills which deserve the immediate attention of the committees of the House and of the House itself. We on the Committee on Military Affairs have before us an investigation of the progress of the national defense program. The three subcommittees are working upon this investigation every day. The investigation is very important to the country at this time, and I think it should continue regardless. I hope the House of Representatives will not recess or take a holiday at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LABOR AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Senate proposes to investigate the causes of the tremendous upsurge of public sentiment against the continuation of union-labor abuses.

It seems passing strange that John Q. Public should be investigated because he writes to his Congressman.

John Q. Public thinks it would be more appropriate if the Senate would investigate why the antistrike bill that the House passed by a vote of 2 to 1 on December 3 has not been acted upon by the Senate.

But in order to help in the investigation of John Q. Public and to determine what makes him tick, I will be glad to submit to the committee the many thousands of letters and telegrams which I have received, and have personally read, protesting against present labor-union domination of our production efforts.

These letters come from mothers concerned for the safety of their boys in the fox holes of Bataan; they come from union members outraged at slow-down practices that retard our production; they come from free American workmen who are being charged today outrageous graft for the privilege of working on a defense job.

They come written on embossed stationery; they come written on postal cards; they come written in lead pencil on common paper.

They come from citizens in every walk of life who are firmly determined that our defense effort shall no longer be delayed and jeopardized to serve the interests of any special group.

If it is an offense for American citizens to write to their Congressmen and voice their complaints and dissatisfaction, I am glad to supply reams of evidence as to why they do so.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this suggestion that people who are insisting that Congress enact legislation removing certain burdens from the war effort be investigated, and to which the gentleman from Virginia has just made reference, is, to my mind, an insult to those who are feeding their offspring, flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone, into the greedy maw of war. It is talk which, if not stopped, will, in my judgment, result in the political hides of a lot of people being nailed to barnyard doors all over this country in the coming election this fall.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like the attention for a moment, if I may, of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who had something to say yesterday about the vicious influences behind these letters that are coming to Congressmen demanding a sound national labor policy. He noticed, undoubtedly, as I did, that a Member of the other body asserts that the Chamber of Commerce of America has been sending out some letters requesting that the people express their views to their Congressmen. In view of what was said yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] it seems that that should be investigated, too. I notice he is nodding his head in the affirmative, agreeing that the source behind those letters should be ascertained. Then I presume that as the chairman of the Committee on Rules he will support the resolution I have introduced for the appointment of a committee to do that very thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include an address by the Honorable James A. Farley, delivered in New York on March 6, and an editorial of the Dallas Times-Herald commending that address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall withhold that until the Chair gets ready to recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a country banker in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HARMONY IN OUR WAR EFFORT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], in our effort to win the war, how we can have harmony in this country and furnish the necessary ammunition, guns, and ships to the armed forces if we do not all work to that end? If we permit radical labor leaders to call strikes, how can you make guns, ships, and airplanes for our armed forces in Hawaii, the Philippines, Australia, Africa, Iceland, and Ireland? We will not have harmony till the President and the Congress use our good offices to that end. That is our duty; that is our business; and we will not let up until we get such harmony. I want the harmony that will win the war. That is the harmony we need. That is the only harmony that will win the war. [Here the gavel fell.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6845, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the Committee rose on yesterday, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] was pending. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 18, line 6, after the comma, strike out "\$604,280" and insert "\$595,384."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls for a saving of less than \$10,000, but it calls for a saving in a department of government where savings are highly desirable.

All of us this morning, I am sure, if we live in that direction, saw the new \$600,000 building going up in the heart of Washington, providing for a central Department of Information. It seems to me that an expenditure of \$600,000 for a temporary building and the appropriation for the Bureau of Information under Lowell Mellett, should be sufficient to supply all the information that every citizen of this country would require in the event he should visit the Nation's Capital.

Our country is calling on us to save on these nondefense appropriations. Here is a saving that is highly essential, and it is in line with hundreds of others relating to information agents in every department. I understood, when this Department under Lowell Mellett was established, that it was created to coordinate all of these agencies and to eliminate confusion here. Instead of fighting the enemy, so many of these fellows are fighting among themselves. I wonder if you observed, as I did, in a recent issue of a Washington paper, this item about a prominent citizen who came to Washington. Here it is:

It has taken me 6 weeks in this town to learn that when these people in Washington say the enemy, they do not mean the Axis; they mean the fellow in the office across the hall.

Let us take these people who are getting in each other's hair off the pay roll and put them to work really doing something worth while to help win the war. An expenditure like this is wholly unnecessary. Later today I will read some letters which have come to me, not from the United States Chamber of Commerce, but from Kiwanis Clubs, Rotary Clubs, farmers, and from people of all over Ohio, asking that we do something to stop these nondefense expenditures. Are you doing your best when you permit an appropriation like this to pass without a word of protest? I commend my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for his fine work of yesterday and today in offering these amendments. I wish the gentleman from Missouri, JACK COCHRAN, were hear, so that I could ask him how many Indians come to Washington in a year's time to ask questions of this information agency. It seems to me that Mr. Mellett has sufficient office and sufficient personnel to answer these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have not a great deal of confidence in political platforms. The last time the Republicans met, I caused to be presented to that organization a platform in regard to handling Indian claims, and I caused to be presented to the Democratic platform the same document. Both major parties of this country at the last election adopted a program in which both parties promised that they would settle these Indian claims, but so far in this Congress nothing has been done, and as long as you do not settle these Indian claims you will be called upon to feed the Indians; you will be called upon to take care of the Indians.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Following what the gentleman has said, I appeared before the resolutions committee at the Democratic Convention in Chicago, where the platform was promulgated on which the Democrats would go before the country for the votes of the people, among them the Indians, and in that platform the Democratic Party pledged itself to determine as quickly as possible on the merits of the Indian claims before the Court of Claims, but up to date we have been unable to get a single bill passed by this House giving permission to the Court of Claims to determine a single claim of the Indians.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, the Republicans did the same thing, although I do not believe the Republicans meant what they said when they said it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Neither one of them meant what they said.

Mr. BURDICK. Just as long as that situation continues, we will have an Indian bill. My hope has always been that we could settle all these claims and get rid of the Indian Bureau itself, but as long as you are going to operate inch by inch, nothing can be accomplished. This committee has kept down the expenses of this bill just about as close as possible, to permit those Indians merely to live. Here is the place where you can save a lot of money, and the chance is good, because you can jump on a defenseless people and take \$10,000 away from them, but the \$3,000 or the \$5,000 or whatever you take, will be taken away from the lives of these Indians. I know of thousands of them that do not have enough to eat. I know that in my reservation alone, where the death rate is very high, it is due to malnutrition. They do not get enough to eat, and all this committee has done is to try to arrange the matter to carry it along. If you want to eliminate expenses, you can do it by first settling and adjusting the claims of the Indians of the United States against the Government. We can then gradually turn the Indians' own business over to the Indians themselves and finally the Indian Bureau can be abolished.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I assume there has been a great deal of guesswork on this whole business of Indians. Frankly, I do not

pretend to be an expert, but I let the record speak for itself. There can be no particular quarrel with the record.

In 1930 we had, according to the census, 332,000 Indians in the country. Of that number approximately 105,000 were under 14 years of age, so that the number of adult Indians was somewhere around 225,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is there anything in the law that prohibits them from going to work and earning their living just like any other citizen?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not a thing that I know of. Now, just bear that figure in mind.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; not yet.

In that year we spent \$17,000,000 on Indians. You can examine the appropriations. They are available to any Member of the House. Now, I find there are 394,000 Indians in 1942. That includes about 30,000 in Alaska, so that we have 364,000 in the United States. But while there has been about a 15-percent increase in the number of Indians and a larger increase in children than in adult Indians, yet the appropriation has gone up 100 percent, because last year it was around \$35,000,000. Now it is \$29,559,000. That does not make sense. Either we have been on bad ground before in our Indian policy or we are on bad ground now. I do not know what it is, but it seems to me there ought to be some realistic thinking on the subject.

Another thing, we have about 12,150 people looking after the Indians. Think of it. That is one person on the pay roll for every 31 Indians. That does not make sense. That excludes 626 who are in the Civilian Conservation Corps and 5 who are doing emergency relief work. You do not have to take my word for it. Look at the personnel table that Secretary Ickes inserted in the forepart of volume I of these hearings. There it is—12,150. So that you have one shepherd for every 31 Indians in the country. It seems to me there ought to be a complete reappraisal of policy.

I found the following statement on page 408 of Secretary Ickes' annual report for 1941. Listen to this language about the duty toward the Indians. It is a very engaging statement.

The Indian problem grows out of the necessity for the Indians continuously to adjust their culture and ancient social forms to modern technology and to modern scientific programs of conservation, health, and education. It stems from the clash of primitive economies with the high-organization processes of production and distribution of their present-day society. It is irritated by the ever-impinging white culture threatening to uproot and cast out the concepts in centuries of habits, experience, and traditions.

What does it mean? I do not know whether they are trying to let the Indian follow out that basic, primitive nature of his or whether they are trying to make white men out of the Indians. If it is the latter, it is a mistaken premise, in my judgment. So I believe that sooner or

later there must be a reappraisal of our Indian policy.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota, who is probably better informed on Indians than any Member of the House.

Mr. BURDICK. Are you in favor of keeping up this Bureau if you can get rid of the entire system?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I sort of like the premise that my good friend from North Dakota advanced yesterday when we were discussing this matter. I will not discuss here the things we were discussing privately, but it was genuinely persuasive.

Mr. BURDICK. You have my permission.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I do like that approach. If we did that, it would be infinitely cheaper for the Government of the United States and far more satisfactory to the Indians.

Mr. BURDICK. May I have the support of the gentleman on the Court of Claims bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It depends on what is in the bill. If you are going to give away the United States and hand it back to the Indians, the answer is "No."

Mr. BURDICK. The Republicans may have promised that but they did not mean it. My question is, Will you go along with us on a bill providing for a claims commission to settle this whole affair and get rid of this Bureau?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say that I think that it is infinitely better than the constant controversy we have had on this floor concerning all these claims that have arisen over a period of years. Certainly if it is an equitable set-up, I think there is some virtue in it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. For the last 7 or 8 years we have claimed that we were trying to make the Indian self-sustaining, but each and every year our Indian population increases and our expense increases, and instead of them being self-sustaining we are only putting more Government employees in the Indian Service, and it is becoming more complicated and more top-heavy as each year progresses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to the gentleman, in the language of the report, that is only the impinging of white culture on this problem, as the annual report of the Department would say.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any reduction of the amount mentioned in this bill for the relief or support of the Indians. If there is any one class of people in this country that has been robbed by the white man and by this Government, it is the Indians. I put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first term I was in Congress, copy of a deed conveying the entire State of Pennsylvania to the Province of Pennsylvania from the Indians, for which the Indians received some articles of personal property, and part of the consideration was beer. That is what they got for that territory. Later on the Indian was gradually driven west, and as minerals and other valuable resources were discovered in those lands, the Government found a way of taking the land away from the Indians and giving it to railroad companies or somebody else. The Indian has been doomed, he has been robbed from the beginning of the Government down to the present time, and this Congress has never come to his full relief notwithstanding the fact that we who know the Indian problems have fought his battle from the time we entered Congress until the present day.

I call your attention to an article I put in the RECORD the other day regarding an Indian soldier. He was an Assiniboine Indian who had enlisted. His father was an Assiniboine and his mother was Cree. This soldier was decorated for daring in the Philippine Islands, for being one of the bravest soldiers MacArthur had. In the entombment of the Unknown Soldier great credit was given the Indians in the first World War.

Patriotism! When it comes to comparison to an Indian, Mr. Chairman, the white man does not look so good. There are more enlistees coming from the Indians, relatively speaking, than from any other class of the people in the United States today. They are the original Americans, and yet we find ourselves neglecting them. I want to give credit, however, to our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I know that if he knew the Indian problem as we know it, if he would ever take time to come out to our State of Montana, and the other States where these Indians live, he would be just as great an advocate of the Indians' rights as any man in this House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I want to take care of all the people of this country. We are spending a tremendous amount of money for the Indians, and we know the Department is doing a great deal of work, but I have not yet been able to find out when we are going to get the Indians to be self-sustaining. The people handling their affairs do not want them to become self-sustaining; they want to have the Indians under subjection so we can keep this great organization that has been built up. I feel just as the gentleman from Montana does, but I think the people who live in the States where these Indians are ought to compel the Bureau of Indian Affairs to try to make these

Indians self-supporting by giving them aid and assistance.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are trying.

Mr. RICH. They should be made good, self-sustaining American citizens. [Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very fine statement that has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Montana. He has always shown a very deep interest in the welfare of the American Indian. None of us, of course, take seriously the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois that the Indian Service should be abolished, if that is what he really meant. That suggestion has been made in the past. At one time in the history of this House, following heated debate, this body actually voted to abolish the Indian Service, but the next day the same House turned around and almost unanimously reversed itself. Let us not again do something as foolish.

If the gentleman from Illinois had his way, then who would administer the 88 or 90 Indian hospitals in the country? Who would administer the 200 Indian schools? Who would administer the many intricate details on the many Indian reservations in America? Who or what agency would administer the various Indian reclamation projects in many of the Western States? It is absurd on the face of it.

Oh, the gentleman from Illinois in offering his amendment says it has to do with so-called propaganda. That, of course, is a high-sounding word. It is being used a lot lately to prejudice Members against certain worth-while activities. When arguments and sound reason fail we hear that bad word "propaganda." This, of course, is not propaganda. This committee has already cut a number of thousand dollars from this salary item. The implication has been made that this item is entirely for press releases. Surely the gentleman knows better than that. Dozens of people come to the Indian Office every day asking for legitimate information; and I say to you the public is entitled to such information.

It would be an absurdity on the face of it to eliminate this small amount for information service.

Let me remind these gentlemen who have been so unduly critical of the Indian Service that this Bureau has already been cut \$718,000, possibly the most drastic cut that has ever been made in the history of that service. This bill, let me remind Members once again, was reduced by the committee nearly \$18,000,000 below the Budget estimate after the Secretary of the Interior had voluntarily cut his Department \$10,000,000 below the original Budget estimate. Again I remind you, it is the first time in the history of the Republic, so far as I am able to find, that any Government official has ever voluntarily reduced his Budget estimate \$10,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintaining law and order on Indian reservations, including pay of judges of Indian courts, pay of Indian police, and pay of employees engaged in the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, marihuana, and deleterious drugs among Indians, and including traveling expenses, supplies, and equipment, \$264,660.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to inquire again as to the amount involved in this appropriation for power. Can the chairman of the subcommittee give me more definite information than he has given heretofore? When I asked him this same question yesterday, or the day before, he replied that it would amount to something like \$50,000,000. Can the gentleman give me more definite information on this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will ask the gentleman from Washington who handled the matter and who is an authority on the subject to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. LEAVY. It is difficult to state it in exact figures because the power features of many of the reclamation projects also involve the reclamation of land itself. The money for power for Bonneville that we passed yesterday also is involved here. I would say a conservative statement would be \$70,000,000 involved for power in one way or the other in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Seventy million dollars?

Mr. LEAVY. I am just making an estimate. I am trying to make a conservative one. It is difficult to segregate the power features from certain other features, both in the Indian Service and in the Reclamation Service as well as in Bonneville.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I see nothing in the hearings that gives us any specific information as to the amount that is to be expended for power or defense.

I think this is important, I believe there should be a break-down of the figures so as to show definitely what portion is to be expended for defense and what part for nondefense.

I fear there is room here in the way the appropriations are set up to spend a lot of money, in the guise of defense, we might well dispense with for the present. I do not wish to infer that it is the intention of anyone to take undue advantage of this situation. Nor do I wish to be understood as opposing any appropriations for defense. I want all power developed that is necessary.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. May I ask the gentleman in all fairness how he can take the position that \$70,000,000 or \$80,000,000 or \$100,000,000 in times like these is too much to spend for electrical energy, for the securing of electrical energy needed, in the light of the fact we are spending billions and billions of dollars in the war effort, the primary feature of which is

sufficient electrical energy, whether it be steam or hydro? Would the gentleman say that these great projects like Boulder, Central Valley, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee should either be closed up or should be given over to some private agency to operate?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I state to the gentleman from Washington that the gentleman from Ohio has not in any manner even intimated that a dime should be taken from the appropriations for the development of power.

Mr. LEAVY. I understood the gentleman to say he thought there was too much spent for power. I may have misunderstood him.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman misunderstood me. Let us allow \$70,000,000 for power development. That still leaves about \$92,600,000 in the appropriation for nondefense expenditures.

In 1931 the total expenditure of the Interior Department was \$66,186,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman realizes, I am sure, however, that many activities have been transferred to it since that time. The gentleman knows that?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The principal item that was transferred from the Interior Department was the Veterans' Administration.

But, I repeat, assuming that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] is correct in his statement that about \$70,000,000 of this proposed appropriation would be allocated to power development there would still be left roundly \$92,600,000 for nondefense purposes. This is about \$26,400,000 more than was spent by the Interior Department in 1931.

I earnestly feel a heavy reduction should be made in the appropriation for nondefense expenditures. Certainly a large portion of the amount carried in the bill for nondefense purposes is needed much more for war production.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the conferring upon General MacArthur of the highest honor that our Government can confer upon anyone, the Congressional Medal of Honor, by President Roosevelt is an act which receives the wholehearted response of our people.

It also recalls to our mind that while some in this body and others throughout the country were demanding General MacArthur's transfer from the Philippines, President Roosevelt had ordered his transfer on February 22. While some, for their own publicity, and for political reasons, were hollering "Bring MacArthur home," President Roosevelt was doing his thinking and his duty as Commander in Chief.

He knew that secrecy was necessary. He knew that the clamor started by some

of his bitter opponents was harmful to our country and detrimental to General MacArthur. He knew that Nazi Germany and the war-maddened leaders of Japan were aware of the fact that in democracies when public opinion, even when wrong, becomes aroused there must be some kind of recognition given by those in control of the Government. They knew this and welcomed this agitation for two reasons: First, it created division here, with resultant lack of confidence in President Roosevelt; and second, they knew that something might happen and they were watching for General MacArthur to leave the Philippines. This increased the danger to this brave general.

We know now that all the time that this important question was being given consideration by President Roosevelt and others, President Roosevelt and our military and naval leaders were giving serious consideration to the problem. We now know that despite the hollerings of the false prophets and the political demagogues the order was given by President Roosevelt on February 22. It was naturally considered long before the actual order was given.

Anyone with common sense ought to know that President Roosevelt, General Marshall, and the General Staff were thinking of General MacArthur day and night. Everyone ought to know that now they are thinking of General Wainwright and his brave men.

The lesson for the American people to learn from this is to do their own thinking, to use their God-given common sense, and not believe everything that some blind-minded Member of Congress might say on or off the floor of the House. Every speech on this floor that brings division and disunity means more graves for the men of our Army and Navy. The clamor to bring MacArthur home was nothing but a political move designed to embarrass President Roosevelt. The worst thing that could have been done on a matter of that kind was to give it the publicity it received. I do not blame the press as they carry news, but I do blame the agitators of such a move. How embarrassed they ought to feel when they now know that all the time those in responsible positions were thinking, and that action was taken at the proper time.

Those same Americans will now change their tactics with another line of sniping. Good Americans, as most of them are, they hate so much, or their partisan feelings are so intense—and I refer only to a few Members—that their reactions to such feelings becloud their love of America. I hope their consciences as American citizens will cause them to "stop, look and listen," and to realize the harm they are doing. In any event, their demagogic utterances on bringing MacArthur home, the worst thing a Member of Congress could have publicly agitated, ought to put the people of the country on guard against such persons so that they pay no heed in the future to what they say.

It is interesting to note that these few Members are on the floor practically every day with 1-minute speeches,

knocking someone, criticizing all the time, never saying anything of a constructive nature. It is also interesting to note that those same Members opposed everything before December 7 recommended by President Roosevelt for the defense of our country.

Constructive criticism is one thing. The men I have in mind have yet to utter one constructive thought. Everything they say produces disunity and division. It is about time they stop it.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, waiving aside with just one brief sentence the observations that have just been made by the distinguished majority leader, I say that I hope it was not his intention to encourage a technique that has already been all too apparent, to infer that patriotism will not permit of any criticism and that criticism must be stifled if unity is to prevail.

A moment or two ago our distinguished friend from Montana made reference to the State of Pennsylvania. Whether he did it purposely or inadvertently, I cannot say, but it does seem to me that I, representing the State of Pennsylvania, cannot let the statement of the gentleman from Montana go unanswered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. In just a moment.

Apparently for the purpose of impressing the House with the idea that the Indians had not been treated fairly, he confined his observations to the agreement made between the Indians and William Penn. In a rather critical way—it may be that he meant it facetiously—he referred to the amount of the consideration, suggesting its inadequacy, and also referred to the type of the consideration, implying its impropriety.

It seems to me that the record of William Penn in his dealing with the Indians is well established. Whether the consideration was partly liquid or not, that should not concern us today. Dear knows, maybe some liquidity today might be of value in some of the deals that are being made. Instead of borrowing so much, if we had liquidity, there might be a benefit all around.

Those of us who come from Pennsylvania are proud of what William Penn did in his dealings with the Indians. If in all instances the equities and the justices had prevailed in the other arrangements with the Indians that were present in Pennsylvania, there would be little to criticize.

Now I yield to my friend. I hope it will be in the nature of an apologetic statement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want the gentleman to know this. The reason I referred to the State of Pennsylvania is that I happen to know considerable about that State. It is one of the richest States and one of the richest territories in the United States. I think the finest farms I have ever seen I have seen in the gentleman's State of Pennsylvania. I might also add it is signally represented in this body.

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman is uncertain as to the cause of that, may I say it is because of the industry, the frugality,

the common sense of the Pennsylvania people. They have gone into the depths of the earth and brought out the minerals; they have taken the fields and have ploughed them, and they have used the resources of God rather than the bounties of a Government subsidy to provide wealth for themselves and the results have stood them in good stead at all times.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But I wanted to show the gentleman and the other Members of the House just how the American Indian was robbed by the American Government, by showing that what is now one of the richest States in the Union was taken away from the Indian by William Penn for the agreed price of \$500, certain personal property, part of which—

Mr. DITTER. I do not yield further. Mr. O'CONNOR. Part of which was in beer.

Mr. DITTER. I will not let that go unanswered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is the truth.

Mr. DITTER. I shall not let that go unanswered. William Penn purloined nothing from the Indians. The memory of William Penn is revered and honored.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is the record.

Mr. DITTER. During the days of colonization no finer record was written than that of William Penn in his treatment of the Indians. William Penn and his Quaker brethren left an unimpeachable record of fair dealing. There was a relationship of friendliness with the Indians. Nothing was left undone to establish good will and understanding. Let it be remembered that Penn insisted that there should be accorded to the Indians "the same liberties to improve their grounds and to provide for the sustenance of their families as the planters." No finer example of friendliness and mutual understanding was evidenced in the colonization period than that which was established and which continued to exist in the settlement of Pennsylvania.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Crown owed a debt of many thousand pounds to the estate of Penn's father at the time the charter was granted to him and that Penn, with a burning zeal for freedom of worship, sought to establish a colony where persecuted Friends might find a sanctuary and a home. Could this be attributed to a spirit of meanness or greed or avarice? Are sharp dealers motivated by worthy purposes such as these? The Quaker heritage is above reproach.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that I should not forego this opportunity to call the attention of the House to one feature of those days of colonization under Penn. I refer to the type of government that was established under him. We might well ponder today on a few of the precepts and principles advocated and adopted in the Quaker settlement. We might profit by a rereading of Penn's opinion when he wrote:

I do not find a model in the world that time, place, and some singular emergencies have not necessarily altered, nor is it easy to frame a civil government that shall serve all places alike. I know what is said by the several admirers of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, which are the rule of one, a

few, and many, and are the three common ideas of government when men discourse on that subject. But I choose to solve the controversy with this small distinction, and it belongs to all three—any government is free to the people under it (whatever be the frame) where the laws rule and the people are a party to those laws; and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, or confusion.

That means a government of laws and not a government of men.

I appreciate the compliment paid by my friend from Montana to Pennsylvania when he said the Keystone State "is one of the richest States and one of the richest territories in the United States." Pennsylvania merits the compliment. It is a fact.

But I should like to emphasize the thought that her wealth is the result of work, the long, hard work of her sons and daughters. The wealth of Pennsylvania represents the industry, the thrift, the resourcefulness, and the frugality of a sturdy citizenry which set itself to the task of carving out not only a political independence but an economic independence as well. A planned economy, a regimented society, a Utopian dream contributed nothing to her wealth. For the most part, Pennsylvanians have always clung tenaciously to the convictions that private enterprise—a free economy—is fundamental to other freedoms; that the reward of industry is the right to a reasonable profit; that our frontiers are measured only by the horizons of our ambitions.

The wealth of Pennsylvania did not come into being as the result of any New Deal philosophy. It was not created by the bounties of any Federal bureaucracy. It did not spring from the largesses and benefactions of a profligate paternalism. We had no Sir Launfal at hand with a never-failing purse supplied by the taxpayers of the Nation. Pennsylvania does not owe its wealth to the spendthrifts, to the profligates, or to those who tried to impress upon the Nation a philosophy that the less we plant the more we reap and the more we waste the more we have.

The Quaker inheritance has stood us in good stead. Old copybook maxims such as "a penny saved is a penny earned" are still taught in many homes in Pennsylvania, and what is more, such precepts are in practice. The workshop, the home—yes, and the meeting house and the church—are a part of the life; in fact, they are the life of the Commonwealth established by Penn more than 250 years ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My friend from Pennsylvania, I yield to you for that statement you were going to make. I have 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, while I do appreciate the very gracious courtesy and kindness extended to me by my

friend from Michigan, I feel that I have made complete answer to my friend from Montana, and that undoubtedly, in due course, he will repent the error of his way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And confess.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of organizing Indian chartered corporations, or other tribal organizations, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), as supplemented and amended by the acts of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 378), May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), including personal services, purchase of equipment and supplies, not to exceed \$3,000 for printing and binding, and other necessary expenses, \$45,000, of which not to exceed \$13,800 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed \$3 per diem in lieu of subsistence may be allowed to Indians actually traveling away from their place of residence when assisting in organization work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure in that part of the State of New Mexico embraced in the Navajo Indian Reservation, and not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for expenditure in said State: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to conduct elections in any reservation on any matter which has been previously voted upon there unless 2 years have elapsed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 19, line 13, strike out line 13 and the remainder of the page, and, on page 20, strike out the first eight lines.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment—

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have time reserved to me if the course of the debate indicates that it may be necessary for me to speak.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Chairman that we should not ask for the closing of debate immediately upon the presentation of an amendment, because I think it only hinders good legislation. I think we ought to let the debate run 5 or 10 minutes and then make the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further so that I may make one brief observation?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think the Members on both sides of the aisle know that an effort is being made by all of us to finish the consideration of this bill today. I am simply trying my utmost to speed up the consideration of the bill, and, if possible, finish before 5:30 o'clock this afternoon. I do not want to cut off anyone who wants to speak; but, again, I

wonder if we could not agree, perhaps, on 20 minutes' debate on this item.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman wait until I get through before submitting the request? I would like to present the amendment and then we will see whether it is necessary to submit such a request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I withdraw the request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will cut out the expenses of 13.2 man-years in the field at a cost of \$37,291, and in the office at Washington 8 man-years at \$16,840, and temporary help in the field of \$1,000 originally provided by the Bureau of the Budget. That is what was requested, and it has been cut down by the committee to \$45,000. I do not know how the man-years will stand with that sort of cut.

This paragraph provides funds for organizing Indian tribes into corporations. Most of the work has been done with the major organizations, and I refer to page 8 of the committee report, where it says:

Additional reductions under the heading "General items" are largely attributable to the need for economy in nondefense activities. In connection with the reduction of \$26,260 in the estimate of \$71,260 for expenses of tribal organization, the committee wishes to point out that it has advised the Bureau on numerous occasions that it expects this item to disappear from the bill in a few years, as it does not regard the organizing of Indians under the Indian Reorganization Act as a continuing or permanent activity.

I call attention to page 44, part 2 of the hearings, showing how we felt about this item in another day. Originally the statute authorized the expenditures to a maximum amount of \$250,000 a year for this purpose. That was when we were hunting for work to do, hunting to give men a chance to work for the Government, and to get them off the streets. Read the hearings on page 45, and you will see the statement as to the amount of expenditures made heretofore in other years for this service. Then on page 50 you will notice a question and answer by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] and Mr. Greenwood, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is what I have in mind. This committee has talked about it and has tried to discourage the promoting of these organizations. If the Indians voluntarily wish to do it, that is their business, but it does seem to this committee that it is not up to the Indian Service to go out to promote this kind of work.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think that pretty good evidence that we have not been engaging in promotion is the fact that out of 192 tribes that voted to accept the Indian Reorganization Act, there are still 106 tribes who have yet to organize; which means that only 86 tribes out of the 192 have actually adopted constitutions and bylaws.

On page 52 you will see what Mr. McCaskill reports, that most of the large groups have completed their organization. The committee thinks that this work should be curtailed. The difference between the committee and myself is that I think we should do it now, because it is not a necessary expenditure. It will not help get any more planes and guns and tanks to General MacArthur this year. I want to be able to go back home

when we finish this bill and say to the mothers whose sons are at the front, at Corregidor, the Philippines, and Australia, that I helped to do away with some of these nondefense expenditures and put the men employed in this type of non-essential work into production of machine tools and the production of equipment for guns and tanks and planes, so that they can help to protect these boys at the front. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the sentiment expressed by me, as read by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] at that time is the same sentiment that I have now, that this committee should curtail, and wind up this particular activity, within a few years, and that is exactly what the committee is doing. Despite the fact that the Indian Service wants more money for this particular activity, the committee has greatly reduced it, until it is now only \$45,000. There are many tribes which are unorganized, and whether Members like it or not, many tribes of Indians are tremendously interested in this item. May I express the hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 34, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vehicles, Indian Service: Not to exceed \$450,000 of applicable appropriations made herein for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation (including the exchange of necessary parts and accessories in part payment for new parts and accessories) of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of employees in the Indian field service, and the transportation of Indian school pupils, and not to exceed \$225,000 of applicable appropriations may be used for the purchase and exchange of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such vehicles shall be used only for official service, including the transportation of Indian school pupils.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 20, line 9, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$350,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to this paragraph in the bill, "Vehicles, Indian Service." It provides that not to exceed \$400,000 for automobiles and motor-propelled vehicles and for transportation shall be available, and so forth. Do you not think that we could cut that down? You are not going to be able to buy automobiles. They will have to do more horseback riding, as we did in the good old days. I only offer this amendment for your consideration because I think it can be cut down, and then if we cut that down, we could prohibit the expenditure of the money which is stipulated in line 17, \$225,000, for the exchange and purchase of automobiles. I think that could be cut down without

any injury to the Indian Bureau, without any injury to anyone, and we will get along this year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course the gentleman understands that this provides for the transportation of Indian school pupils and the gentleman is aware of the fact that many of the schools are now of the consolidated type, and that it is necessary to operate busses.

Mr. RICH. I am not here to interfere with those schools. I am just thinking of the great number of people in the last few years that have had automobiles in the Department. I do not want to cut these Indian schools or the transportation of these children, but I do want to cut out the needless running around with these Government cars. If they have to economize a little, the Indian Bureau will demand of every automobile driver that he should not use the car except when it is absolutely necessary. I think the gentleman from South Dakota will recognize the fact that if we cut this down some, that will be the result.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly am in favor of cutting down the travel of Indian Bureau employees, but I would like to know, as a matter of making a judgment on the gentleman's amendment, what amount was appropriated for this item last year?

Mr. RICH. I asked to cut this down \$100,000. If you adopt that amendment, then I will offer an amendment, in line 17, to cut that down \$100,000. That will not cut down the sum total, however. It will only take \$100,000 off of this item.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does this already represent a reduction from last year's figure?

Mr. RICH. Yes; a small reduction, not very large.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can the gentleman give us the figure?

Mr. RICH. I do not just recall it. It is in the justification.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is hard to tell how much to cut something that has already been cut.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. The Budget estimate was \$495,000.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. LEAVY. And the committee cut \$45,000 from that. On the Budget estimate of \$495,000, we were asked to allow \$303,000 for the transportation of Indian children to school. We reduced that sum to \$200,000; and if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, you would leave the Indian Service with virtually half the money, and they could not render the service.

Mr. RICH. Let me say to my colleague, if you adopt this amendment, we will offer an amendment, on page 20, line 17, to cut that down \$100,000, and that will take it out of "purchase of new automobiles." Then we will get along with that figure. That is what I am trying to do. I am trying to stop them from going out and getting new cars. Let us

make these cars last a little longer. Service them a little more, and we can save that money.

Mr. LEAVY. We were told that they could not get new cars without the approval of the War Department and the Navy Department. We were told that they have already taken 200 army horses and are now using saddle horses to perform many of their duties. If you cut further, you cut to the point where they cannot render the service at all.

Mr. RICH. No. I differ with my colleague.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. According to the report, the appropriation for this purpose last year—supplies, purchases, and transportation—was \$799,720. The Budget estimate was \$800,000, and the amount appropriated, which includes this item and one or two others, was \$799,000, or a cut of \$720. So they are not going to be allowed these automobiles anyway. I think the gentleman is on the trail of something in suggesting that we cut this down, because there has not been any cut.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am rather amazed at the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that there has not been any cut in this item. The committee made a reduction of \$46,000, as shown by the bill, on this item alone.

Mr. TABER. Where does that show in the report? The report shows that on this transportation item the cut is \$720. This is on page 21 of the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman, I am sure, knows that it does not show in the bill, because it is not an appropriation—that it is an authorization to use funds in the bill available for this purpose.

Mr. TABER. But it should show in the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure the gentleman does not contend that it would show in an authorization.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. This is an appropriation of \$450,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman's insistence convinces me he has not studied the bill. I stand on the statement that it is merely an authorization. The gentleman surely knows that if he has made any real examination of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Alright, I am glad that is settled. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] said he did not want to interfere with the schools, and I am assuming he is sincere in making that statement. Now here are the facts. There are 200 Indian schools which, if this amendment is adopted, will be seriously interfered with. Some of those schools are in widely scattered areas, 25 or 30 miles apart. I am sure the gentleman does not intend to do that, seriously cripple the hauling of Indian children to school.

For the benefit of those few on the minority side who are so fearful lest too much funds will be spent for cars, I will

read into the Record this part of the bill that has been mentioned several times before, so that there will be no further weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth about this item. Section 8, which appears on page 140 of the bill, reads as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for the purchase or exchange of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle if such purchase or exchange interferes with the priorities or quotas for military and naval purposes as determined, respectively, by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

It is perfectly obvious that it will be impossible to spend money for this purpose unless it is certain it does not interfere with priorities established by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the acquisition of lands, interest in lands, water rights and surface rights to lands, and for expenses incident to such acquisition (except salaries and expenses of employees), in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 985), \$165,000: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 22, line 12, after "(48 Stat. 985)" strike out "\$165,000" and insert "0."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is only for the purpose of prohibiting the Indian Bureau from going out and buying lands to the value of \$165,000. You will notice in this paragraph that in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming we prohibit the Indian Bureau from going out and buying these lands because those States do not want them to buy any more.

The bill carries an item of \$165,000 for the purchase of land. It is proposed to purchase this land in other States. A lot of people do not want this done. It is not necessary that it be done. Here is an opportunity to save \$165,000 for the Treasury of the United States, if you do not want to take the bottom out of it, but I think it has dropped out already. They have got to find this \$165,000 with which to purchase these lands. It is not right.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. In the first place, this \$165,000 is not money belonging to the United States, it is money belonging to the Indians, and those who govern them feel it is a wise thing to spend it in the acquisition of land. Four States of the Union where there are Indian lands have said they do not want the lands purchased with tribal funds. The rest of the States do. It is not public money. The

spending of this money would save the Government paying 4 percent interest on it. If you want to make a saving let them invest it in the land. It is their money.

Mr. RICH. The language of this paragraph does not say that it is money paid out of tribal funds. Even if it were I would advise against it because we have let them spend so many of their tribal funds that they are dependent on the Government when they ought to support themselves. They spend their funds and what do they do? They come back to us and we have to dig into our own Treasury to secure additional money. Five States have refused to permit them to buy land within their borders.

Mr. LEAVY. I want to say to my friend from Pennsylvania that I was in error on that, tribal funds are in the paragraph above.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Washington very seldom is in error, but there are a lot of fellows on that side of the House who are in error when they vote for the expenditure of all these moneys we do not have. Mr. Chairman, we can save this \$165,000, let us save it now.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to observe to the gentleman that this is to buy pasture land for the flocks and herds of the Indians, a most essential thing, that they may produce and be self-supporting.

Mr. RICH. You know, we have been pasturing every Indian in the United States for a good many years. We have been pasturing most of the people of this country until now it has come to the point where the people should get out of pasture and work. We want people to work, we do not want to pasture them any longer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. From what is going on around here it looks as though we are having almost as much trouble withholding this country from the Indians as we had originally in taking it from them. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There may be food for thought in the gentleman's clever observation.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should make such a suggestion seriously to this House. The gentleman is one of the best businessmen in this body, whose word, I am sure, can be relied upon.

I am certain that if the gentleman made a contract he would carry it out in the spirit as well as to the letter of the contract, but now by this amendment he calls on Members of this House to repudiate and refuse to carry out a solemn contract made by the Congress of the United States. If Members will

examine last year's law you will find it reads as follows:

Provided—

This is a contract authorization, an ironclad contract—

That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations and enter into contracts for the acquisition of additional land not exceeding a total of \$325,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for the acquisition of land pursuant to the authorization contained in the act of June 18, 1934, shall be available for the purpose of discharging the obligations so created.

If the gentleman wants to vote for his own amendment, he can accept the responsibility.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says everybody has got to work. The spending of this money will enable the Indians to do more work and produce more things.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Then the gentleman is simply repudiating his own statement that we ought to do more work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, if I may have the attention of the membership of the House, including the author of this amendment, that anyone who fully understands the purpose of this particular appropriation will vote against the amendment. In the first place the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania was based upon a belief that certain States had asked not to have any of this money expended within their States. That is not the case. These States only sought to prevent expanding the boundaries of the reservations within those States. If you will read the proviso in the bill itself, it is stated:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within these States: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming, outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

That limitation is not against spending some of this money in those States if it is within the boundaries of existing reservations, but only outside of those reservations.

In the second place, there seems to be a misunderstanding as to the purpose of this appropriation. It is not new cash; it is an item to pay contracts incurred under obligations authorized and contracted last year.

Within each Indian reservation you have an heirship land problem. When an Indian dies his land goes to probate. He may have many heirs. Then you have a very complicated problem. There

are estates in my district, for example, where there are several hundred heirs involved in a single quarter section of land. In an attempt to try to resolve that heirship land to a common denominator it has been sought to buy up certain tracts of land and get them so that the assets can be divided and the estates closed. You have instances where the lease fees, or the amount of lease fees going to an individual interest holder in some of these heirship lands amounts to only a fraction of a cent. It costs more to write a letter and write a check sending 2 or 3 cents to some of these heirship interest holders than is involved in the total amount of money itself. In one reservation over 30,000 acres of good land were idle a year ago simply because it cost more to divide and distribute the lease returns than they amounted to. This fund is used to buy up these fractional interests and make it possible to close these estates and put the land on a revenue basis.

Now then, with respect to this matter in the bill, last year there was a contract authorization for \$325,000 for the purchase of this fractionated land. The funds here involved are to pay approximately one-half of that obligation. If you will turn to the hearings, page 64, you will find it clearly stated that "all" of the item carried in this bill "will be required to meet obligations incurred in accordance with the authority contained in last year's Interior bill. That bill carried \$325,000 in cash and an equal amount in contract authorization." The Treasury impounded \$160,000 of that \$325,000 contract authorization. I repeat, there was cash \$325,000 last year plus a contract authorization of \$325,000. The Treasury impounded \$160,000 of the \$325,000 contract authorization, leaving \$165,000 that could be contracted. Contracts for that land acquisition have been made. So, this appropriation is merely to provide the money to take care of the contracts made under the contract authorization last year which itself had been reduced one-half from the original authorization as approved by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Wherein was I mistaken?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman's words gave the House the impression that certain States would not have any money expended within the boundaries of those States. The language of the bill refers to the boundaries of existing reservations within those States. This money is available for settling this land problem within the boundaries of existing reservations in all States. The limitation is only against going outside the reservations in certain States.

Mr. RICH. We have had men from these States come to us and say that they did not want the Indians to buy any of this land.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They do not want the reservations expanded, but the gentleman will understand that within the boundaries of the reservations

there are Indian lands, and there are also patented lands. The limitation and the objections are not against action within the reservations. This appropriation primarily is for the purpose of purchasing these Indian heirship lands already owned by Indians, but in such a complicated state of land ownership that it costs the Government more money to administer the heirship lands than it does to buy the land itself.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say as one of the Representatives of the State mentioned that the gentleman from South Dakota is making an extremely fine statement. He is well informed on the subject, and I subscribe to everything he says.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say as a Representative of the State of Arizona that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] occupying the Well of the House has stated the facts as they are in regard to this matter. I say this as a member of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, for I have noted these conditions. Also, let me emphasize that such lands purchased in Arizona must be within the boundaries of existing reservations.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it more important now to the winning of the war to spend this \$165,000 for an airplane for MacArthur in Australia or to go out and buy this land and take the money out of the Treasury for that purpose?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That issue is not involved at all. The gentleman knows that we are going to appropriate all the money we can spend to get airplanes to MacArthur. This item is to satisfy contract authorizations already legally made.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase of land for the Indians of the Round Valley Reservation, Calif. (tribal funds): The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$10,000, contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, for the purchase of land and improvements thereon for the Indians of the Round Valley Reservation, Calif., payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians, is hereby continued available until expended.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I add to that request that I want to speak out of order for only 1 minute, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order. If there is objection, I will not pursue it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have made the statement that I would oppose anyone speaking out of order. I will not object in this in-

stance, but I give notice now I certainly shall object in the future.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, we are endeavoring to finish this bill today. While I am not going to object to the gentleman's request to speak for 1 minute out of order, I shall be constrained to object to any further request to speak out of order that may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy shown to me by the gentlemen in charge of the pending legislation. I shall detain the Committee only a few moments. I rise at this time as a matter of personal pride and deserved recognition for the State in which I live.

Last night in Madison Square Garden, New York City, West Virginia University, participating in the finals of the national basketball tournament, defeated Western Kentucky State by a score of 47 to 45, thus winning this recognition for our State.

The coach of that great mountaineer team, Dyke Raese, of Davis, resides in my district. I pay tribute to those boys of the hills of West Virginia who defeated the splendid boys from the hills of Kentucky. The West Virginians, displaying their recognized fighting qualities, fought successfully against odds.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of developing agriculture and stock raising among the Indians, including necessary personnel, traveling and other expenses, and purchase of supplies and equipment, \$693,180, of which not to exceed \$10,000 may be used to conduct agricultural experiments and demonstrations on Indian school or agency farms and to maintain a supply of suitable plants or seed for issue to Indians, and not to exceed \$30,000 may be used for the operation and maintenance of a sheep-breeding station on the Navajo Reservation, and not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for defraying the expenses of Indian fairs, including premiums for exhibits.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 26, line 19, strike out all of line 19 and the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph relates to the Agriculture Department of the Interior Department. A few weeks ago we spent considerable time getting through the appropriations for the Agriculture Department. Generally the people had the belief that that would finish all the agricultural work, but here is a provision for an expenditure of \$693,180 for agricultural work among the Indians in the Interior supply bill. In addition to what they get under this program, the Department of Agriculture supplements Interior Department work with soil-conservation payments. Apparently some of the work of that Department converges with the work of the Interior Department.

I questioned representatives of the Department about this subject and they

denied that there is any overlapping of the program. Even should there be no overlapping of the program, I think all the agricultural work ought to be in one place, and the place to have it is the Agricultural Department.

Let me call your attention to page 117 of the hearings, which shows some of the work that is being carried on by this branch:

Home-extension work.

For Indians, now, mind you.

Improved living and better homes in cooperative communities summarize the many activities in which home-extension agents and home aids help Indians to attain more satisfying home life. Increased membership in farm chapters and women's clubs has meant a spread of ideas of self-help and definite progress in farm and home betterment.

Think of it; this is with Indian people.

The variety of activities conducted in home-extension work includes child care, including feeding and development.

Remember, we have a department of Government for child care that takes care of this sort of thing, and the Indian Service is duplicating the work.

Food; nutrition, including storing, canning, drying, brining, and smoking of meats; food production; nutrition studies.

All of these things are covered in pamphlets of the Department of Agriculture, and this does not feed Indians. It pays the fat salaries and traveling expenses of Indian Service bureaucrats:

Food preparation and serving; clothing for adults and children; better bedding; home improvements; sanitation; household pest control—

This does not mean their putting Indians to bed. The bureaucrats for a fat salary are telling the Indians how to do it.

Listen to this, for an Indian:

Tentmaking.

Think of it! A program of tentmaking! You might as well have a program of getting umbrellas for fishes as show Indians how to make tents. Yet tentmaking appears on page 118 of the hearings.

I suggest that this is a wild-eyed, socialistic scheme for the Indians that we could just as well get along without; and in view of the fact that there is some work done by the Department of Agriculture among the Indians, this could all very handily and very well be done by the Department of Agriculture, so that when we finish with that appropriation and supply bill we will have done with it for good.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rose first to ask a question but I have stood here in rapt amazement, or something of that sort, listening to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in pathetic tones talk about doing some of these things for the Indians. He said:

Think of it, helping the Indians to have better homes. Think of it, helping the Indians to have child welfare and training in gardening and preservation of foods. Think of it, doing some of these other things for the Indians.

Why should this not be done for Indians if for the others you mention?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. Because we have a children's bureau in Washington, and they have pamphlets with beautiful pictures that show anybody how to do these things. Each Congressman sends them out to his constituents.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is exactly the answer I expected the gentleman to make. Can the gentleman cite a single one of those pamphlets that is written in Sioux or written in any other Indian language? Can he assure me that the Indians who need this help the most are able to read, even if these pamphlets were printed in those languages? Has the gentleman ever been on an Indian reservation in his life or visited an Indian home, with its dirt floor and leaking sod roof? Has he ever seen an Indian home in winter?

Did he ever see the kitchen in a ration Indian's home—a corner in a miserable room, a can for the few pounds of flour or beans that were to feed the family for a month? The family—three generations, perhaps, an old man or a woman on whose face time had written the tragedy of a race, a father and mother who were trying to master a white man's economy, children who were trying to learn how to work a white man's way, and had yet to learn the white man would deny them jobs?

Tents? Help in making tents? Has the gentleman ever seen little Indian children freezing in winter because they did not have a decent tent? Would the gentleman deny them that?

Has the gentleman ever visited an Indian reservation and seen Department of Agriculture officials attempting to help them? No; they have had to depend upon the Indian Bureau. I admit and I feel that the Indian Service spends a lot of time and money traveling, too much in fact, and it has too much bureaucratic authority, perhaps, yet God knows that justice calls for doing something for these Indians, whose lands we took away.

They are not getting aid from the Department of Agriculture. Were the funds that are available to the Farm Security Administration available for Indian loans a few years ago? No. The Comptroller General or somebody said they were not available. The Indian did not come under that program. So we provided a little aid for him, a little leadership, a little help in growing gardens, a little help in canning and preserving foods.

The gentleman cannot correct the situation he mentions by denying an Indian help from money in this bill. If he would go back and correct the basic legislation of Congress and say that the Department of Agriculture shall have the responsibility for taking care of these people and providing for them, that would be something else. But after you have passed the agricultural appropriation bill—and the funds were cut down there—then to come along, when the Indians are already denied funds and

help from the Agriculture Department, and in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill to say, "We are going to cut this out of the Indian appropriations," is hardly fair.

I am sure that the gentleman from Ohio, for whose sincerity and for whose intelligence I have the utmost respect, if he were to visit an Indian reservation and see the Indians in actual life and see the conditions under which they live, would not talk this way. He might feel that we ought to have transferred some of the assistance in the agricultural bill, perhaps, and put it here, but he would not propose to deny this aid to the Indian people, people who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to be severe, I do not intend to be critical. But I have seen these people, the Indians. They get hungry. They grow cold. In a generation we have forced them to change from a hunter to a farmer, and a farmer on land that the white man did not want. Only those who live among them and have seen them in their homes and know the conditions can understand the importance of helping them to raise better livestock and better crops. Talk about economy, the best economy we can exercise in respect of Indian appropriations is to see that the Indians do have some help in raising better livestock and do have some help in raising more food so that it takes them off relief, so that it makes them independent and gives them a chance to be on their own. Do not deny the man who is down a chance to get on his own. That is what would be the effect of the pending amendment. And do not do it here just because you can and they are only Indians.

They are Indians. God made them Indians. The white conqueror made them what they are today. Let us give them a helping hand. We have no braver, truer fighters today than our Indian soldier boys.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Dakota for describing so graphically an Indian home in this country and describing the manner in which his lands have been taken away from him, and the manner in which he has been neglected by this Government. I want to say that the American people owe the gentleman from South Dakota a debt of gratitude for explaining to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] who has never seen an Indian home, what the conditions are.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph end in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for his very clear statement on the conditions of Indian life. This particular section of the bill deals with the development of Indian agriculture and is an extremely important section.

I desire to call the attention of this House to page 121 of the hearings on the Interior departmental appropriation bill, in which it is pointed out that the livestock on the Navajo Reservation, and elsewhere where this program has been in effect, have increased from 167,000 to 278,000 head. This Government and this Congress can be proud of the fact that the Indians have been improving in their economic status, that they are becoming self-sufficient, and that they are making physical progress at the same time.

I want to point out to you that at one of our Government ordnance depots, just constructed at Fort Wingate, N. Mex., near a Navajo reservation, 2,000 Navajos worked as common laborers on that job. Their labor brought forth the commendation of the contractors and the War Department.

I also want to say that when you can make a showing of this nature, where the race itself is increasing, where their herds of livestock are increasing, where they are becoming economically self-sufficient, you show democracy at work in the finest sense of the word, and you making a showing that appeals to the countries south of this Republic that have a large Indian population. The American Society of Indianists has approved of the work done under this program.

I do not want to take the time of the House, but I do want to commend the gentleman from South Dakota, and I do want to point out that the Government has officially recognized the value of this work which has produced an increase in the livestock of the Indians.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Coming from a neighboring State with a population of the largest portion of the 50,000 Navajo Indians, I can agree with the gentleman's statement concerning our Navajo Indians. I also want to commend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for his statement. I want to add just this word, if I may:

The Navajo Indians are increasing in number by leaps and bounds. They are the most prolific tribe of Indians in our country, I believe. We talk about the vanishing red man. However, the Navajo Indians occupy a region along the tributaries of the Colorado River, and if we do not help them conserve the soil we are going to lose one of the greatest works of man on this continent. I refer to Boulder Dam or Lake Mead, which is filling up with silt. So I much prefer to see the Navajos helped in conserving their soil and making good farmers of themselves than to see anything done that would bring destruction to one of our greatest irrigation projects.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman from Arizona, and I assure this House that if the Members would visit the Navajo Reservation, would visit the Navajos in their homes, and see the progress that has taken place, they would be proud of the Congress, they would be proud of the Indian Service, and they would be proud of democracy at work. It is a fine thing in which we can all take pride.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that he is not the only one who has Indians in his district. We have Indians in my district, the Pottawatomies and the Ottawas, and the members of both tribes are taking care of themselves very nicely. They have not had very much from the Government. We have some Indians also in Cass County and in Van Buren County, in Michigan, and they are taking care of themselves. I know that every time we take up one of these Indian items, in which Members are interested, there is opposition to any cut, and I can appreciate that, but I try to go along and cut on everything that comes up that is not essential to the war effort, whether it affects my district or not. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish me to yield?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I may say, in answer to the gentleman from South Dakota, that it is a surprise to me, after hearing of the deplorable conditions among the Indians, that there were any here to meet our forefathers at Plymouth Rock. In the first place, this amendment strikes at a duplication of effort between the Agricultural Department and the Interior Department. In the second place, the gentleman talks about his Sioux not being able to read the child-care books that are being prepared in the Children's Bureau. I say to you that Nelson Rockefeller and his outfit have \$18,000,000 in cash and contract authorizations of which a part is used to reprint into Spanish and Portuguese, for the Indians of South America, these Children's Bureau books. In God's name, if they have them for South America, what is the matter that they cannot get them to the Sioux in the same program? It is not my fault that the Sioux in the gentleman's State, and the Indians of the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from New Mexico get none of these pamphlets. It is not my fault; it is the fault of this administration, and I am not holding out by this appropriation any amount for the books that Mr. Rockefeller has that he could give to these people. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry that I cannot yield. The gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. JONES] has spent days and nights working on this bill. He has made every effort along the line of economy; he has tried and is trying to cut out unnecessary items; and yet when he proposes to do something Members are absent from the floor, not here to vote, or they oppose his efforts. Such conduct is no incentive to work. While you are trying to do something for the Indians, why not give a little effort toward supporting the committee members when they put in their time and devote their efforts to giving us information on the bill, and offer intelligent and money-saving amendments from the floor? I do not want to hurt the Indians—I do not want to hurt anybody—but I am asking the membership to remember their own Republican committeemen, who are trying to do something and turn some of this tide of wrath, which is arising against Congress, against the Members of this House, who do not deserve it, back where it belongs, to the body at the other end of the Capitol, and on the President's doorstep. That is where it belongs; that is where it should rest.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, Mr. Chairman; I cannot.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the whole difficulty that has arisen here about this appropriation comes from the fact that there is not any duplication in the agricultural effort. This \$693,180 for the purpose of farm improvements among the Indians, is a deserving item. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] may be right, but the difficulty is that we cannot get any help from the Agricultural Department. Practically all of these advantages go to the white people, and we are told, "these do not apply to the Indians at all." We had a most difficult time in North Dakota to permit the Indians to share in the sales tax, which is a relief measure, and although the Indians are paying the sales tax, it took about 4 months before we got an opinion that those Indians were entitled to any relief. They always say, "Go back to the Indian Bureau." I think it would be a mistake to cut out this section, because it is not a fact that is recognized in this country that the Agricultural Department has to take care of these Indians.

If we can help the Indians to get a start in livestock, good seed, gardens, and moisture conservation, we can, by so doing, prevent hungry Indian children, sick and emaciated adults, old and helpless Indians. Who is there who opposes this program? Those who oppose this provision certainly do not know the essential facts of the case.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 22, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Oh, let us try to have a quorum here. I think we should have at least 100 men on the floor. It seems

terrible to me that we should go ahead with a bill of this kind, when we are trying to save money for the Government and cannot get 100 men on the floor of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of irrigation systems, and for purchase or rental of irrigation tools and appliances, water rights, ditches, and lands necessary for irrigation purposes for Indian reservations and allotments; for operation of irrigation systems or appurtenances thereto when no other funds are applicable or available for the purpose; for drainage and protection of irrigable lands from damage by floods or loss of water rights, upon the Indian irrigation projects named below, \$193,275, reimbursable, together with \$44,500 operation and maintenance collections, from which latter amount expenditures for any one project shall not exceed the aggregate receipts from such project covered into the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934:

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, much is being said here about our American Indians by people who apparently know very little about them or know very little about the present conditions of our Indian wards.

I wish to tell the Committee that I have the honor to represent many Indians who belong to the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Tribes. They live in the Third District of Nebraska—a district which I represent in this Congress. Long before coming to Washington I learned much about the Indians who live in Nebraska. For many years I have known many of the individual members of the Omaha and Winnebago Tribes. Some of these individuals are and have been officers of the tribal councils, and many of them have been and are today among the prominent and outstanding citizens of our State. Many of them have served in the Spanish-American War, the first World War, and some of them are in the service of our country today. It was from some of these individual friends among these Indian tribes that I learned much about their problems. I visited them many times before coming to Congress, and since becoming their Representative in Washington I have visited them personally many times. I want to tell the membership of this House that the Indians in my district are among the most patriotic citizens in our land, and I for one can never bring myself to the position to allow them to be treated in any way other than other American citizens. When we pass legislation dealing with any portion of our citizens, I feel that there should be no thought of race, creed, or color and that all should be treated alike. I know that the Indians in my district are not asking for any better or any worse treatment than is accorded to any other citizen. All they ask is for equality. But I know, and many of you know—if you will be fair in your judgment on some of the Indian legislation offered here from time to time—that the Indian citizen and Indian legislation do not get

fair treatment and impartial consideration.

It is true that some of our older Indian men and women do not read or write the English language. There are not so many of these older Indians left in my district. Many have gone to join their ancestors. But a majority of those who are still with us are intelligent. They do understand the English language and they do read and write. Many of them are highly intelligent and are numbered among the brightest scholars attending our schools. Many of them have attained high places in the world of learning; high places in the field of athletics and sports; high places in the field of agriculture. All of them are interested in what we do here and all of them are anxious for progress and advancement for all free Americans.

I wish to tell my colleagues that the Indians of the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Tribes are aware of the crisis which our country faces today and they are and will continue to do their part in saving this Nation and bringing about a victory. I do hope that it is well understood here that the Indians of the Third District of Nebraska can be depended upon to play their part with all other Americans in shouldering their responsibilities at all times as highly patriotic American citizens.

I have spoken here many times about the treatment which has been accorded our Indians. I only need to tell you briefly the story of the Winnebagoes who were driven from their homes at the point of bayonets and shipped away like animals. It is well known how they were robbed of their lands and how they were exploited. This story I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many times. It need not be fully repeated here today. But I say these few words merely to refresh your memory that the white man has not always been fair to the Indian and that he has not treated him with the equality to which the Indian is entitled.

We are considering a very important bill here today. It makes the annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior. In it are the regular items to conduct the affairs of the Indian Service. Many items have been cut because it is generally conceded that we must cut non-defense items in order that we can concentrate on the main objective of today—that of winning this war in the shortest space of time possible and with the least number of casualties. Our Indian people are agreeable to that. The committee has already cut the bill many thousands of dollars. The committee made those cuts after careful consideration and after many days of hearings. But it is proposed here to cut more deeply on items which are highly important to the life of the Indian people. I am glad the membership has joined in defeating the further cut in the item of agriculture. The proposal to eliminate all rehabilitation for the Indian must also be defeated. There are many reasons why these cuts must not be made. One is because the Indians in my district depend entirely for their lives on agriculture. It is our only origin for our food and life. You people from the big cities and from the

East must realize that our Indians are among the best farmers in our country and that the land on which they live must produce for them the food to feed their families and livestock. You have already made a deep cut in the item but we must not wipe it out entirely. There are many unemployables among our older men and older women on the Indian reservations. Would you take away from them and give to others only? I wish I could take you over the Indian country in my district and show you some of the homes in which these Indians are forced to live. Women and children in my Indian country have slept on the icy ground many a night when the mercury hovered far below zero because they had no better place to sleep. Of course, our Indians live in tents many times. They have been forced to do that many years because they were discriminated against. The hardships they have suffered are indescribable.

On behalf of the membership of the tribal councils of the Omaha and Winnebago tribes, I wish to thank the committee for allowing to remain in the bill the items for utility work on the Winnebago Reservation, the item for the continued maintenance of the hospital at Winnebago, and the item to allow the Omaha council to purchase some land to provide a farm for an Indian or two. But that is a mere pittance so far as the real needs that are required out there.

I hope that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will spread the appropriations contained in this bill so as to take care of the Indians on the Winnebago, Omaha, and Santee Reservations, in spite of the cuts made in the matter of road work and education. The road work has provided much work for our Indians, and certainly we must give our Indian children the same opportunity for education as is given the children of other Americans. The item of irrigation contained in this bill is of great interest to us. Many members of the Omaha Tribe home that someday we can have some of this work done on that reservation.

But temporarily, Mr. Chairman, I feel our Indians will forego some of the non-essentials in order that we can put all our strength into winning the war. But in making these decreases I hope there will be no discrimination against the Winnebagoes, Omahas, and the Santees when the time comes for the distribution of these funds. Our Indians have made many, many sacrifices in the past. They are willing to make more sacrifices in order that victory will come to us. The burden of this war must be shouldered by every American in an equal manner. The Indians of Nebraska—those of the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Tribes—have answered the call before. They are answering again today. They are great Americans. Give them equality.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eufaula, Okla.: For 140 pupils, \$49,590; for pay of principal, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, \$7,000; in all, \$56,590.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask

unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, Carter Seminary at Ardmore, Jones Academy at Hartshorne, and Wheelock Academy at Millerton are all in my congressional district in Oklahoma. These are old and established schools of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians.

Our people in Oklahoma, and especially the Indians of the southeastern section of the State, are proud of each of these educational institutions.

I was amazed to learn that the Indian Service, as well as the Bureau of the Budget, favored closing of five Indian schools in the State. Wheelock Academy is one of those that has been definitely slated to go.

I congratulate the Committee in its far-sighted vision in retaining funds to continue Wheelock and the other schools involved. I merely rise now to plead again, as I did before the Committee, for the continuation of these Indian schools, and I wish to insert my recent statement before the subcommittee on appropriations, headed by my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. JEN JOHNSON:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee is pleased now to hear Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, my personal friend for many years, and chairman of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress. He is also chairman of the House Roads Committee, a true friend of the Indian, and an able and conscientious Member of Congress who is a credit to Oklahoma and the Nation.

Mr. LEAVY. I would like to add too that he is an intelligent and industrious member of this body who is always on guard, not only for the interests of his own State but of all the States.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And of all the roads in the country.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Gentlemen of the committee, I am flabbergasted by such a wonderful introduction. I wish I could measure up to the possibilities and responsibilities which you have dedicated to me. But this is not a mutual admiration society. I understand that word has been passed out that five Indian schools in Oklahoma must be abolished. I appear here in opposition to such proposed action.

I am especially interested in the retention of Wheelock Academy for Choctaw girls at Millerton, Okla., in the heart of the old Choctaw Nation.

The total enrollment of this school averages around 145 per year. The average attendance is 132, consisting of 84 full bloods, 48 of one-half or more, and all others one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood.

Since 1933 approximately 375 girls have been enrolled. Some of these entered the primary grade and remained until the course was finished. A small number was enrolled for a year only. The time for the others averages 5 years.

Preference is given to restricted Indian girls, to those from broken homes, to total orphans, to half orphans, and to those not within reach of public or Indian day schools.

Most of the children come from needy homes and need the Government care they get at the school. Think how the State would object if this number were added to the already heavy load for relief.

The Choctaw people are deeply interested in this school and are greatly distressed at the proposal to close it.

The word "economy" was brought up here awhile ago. I appreciate that and want to go along with the economy program wherever it is reasonable and possible. But I cannot recognize economy to the extent of saving a few dollars at the expense of the poorest orphans in the country in doing away with their schools.

Wheelock Academy was established a little over a hundred years ago, when the Choctaw Tribe was brought from Mississippi to the Indian Territory, now Oklahoma. It has 160 acres of good land and 18 buildings in good shape; 13 of the buildings belong to the Choctaw Tribe and 5 belong to the Federal Government.

The Choctaw people are poor and they need all the help they can get from the Government. They have practically no oil and what little wealth there is does not go to the tribe, as it does in the case of the Osages, because the Choctaw land has been allotted to individuals. The only tribal property they have consists of coal deposits and they have received nothing from them for many years.

So I am unalterably opposed to abolishing these schools, and particularly this one school in my district.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understand your statement, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, the Wheelock Academy is made up of students who are either orphans or from broken homes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And this school is more than 100 years old, and the Indians themselves are deeply interested in the school and are very much distressed about the proposal to close it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I also understand that the school has 160 acres, and that there is sufficient room for expansion of the school in case the Indian Service and the committee should ever be able to find funds to expand it. Is that correct?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is right. It is situated in the Choctaw Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is my understanding that probably the poorest Indians in the country, so far as we know, reside in eastern Oklahoma. And I understand that, while you favor economy, you do not favor it to the extent of economizing a few pennies, comparatively speaking, at the expense of the poorest orphan children of the country, who are unable to help themselves.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is right. And there are something over 130 orphan children there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Are there any further questions? If not, we thank you for your statement. I might add that I shall later propose some real economies that will enable the committee to provide funds to retain this and other schools proposed to be abandoned—in the name of economy.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general support and rehabilitation of needy Indians in the United States, \$1,000,000, of which amount not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available for expenses of Indians participating in folk festivals, and not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for administrative expenses incident thereto, including personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed \$35,000) and elsewhere.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 53, line 4, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$500,000."

In line 6, strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$22,500."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to reduce the amount for needy Indians and Indian rehabilitation from \$1,000,000 to \$500,000. In the Budget for 1942 they had \$1,150,000. That was scaled down \$50,000 in the Budget estimates. Then the committee scaled it another \$50,000, so that it is \$150,000 below 1942.

You will notice on page 10 of the committee report this language:

The committee is of the opinion that war expenditures should open up means of obtaining employment to many Indians, and that this form of relief expenditure should be reduced to the minimum.

I think, in line with the general trend, that this item could well be reduced from \$1,000,000 to \$500,000, notwithstanding the representations that were made by those from the Indian Bureau who appeared before the subcommittee.

I was rather interested to see that they represented to the subcommittee that there were as many as 35,000 Indians on needy relief and that the equivalent of 25,000 of this number had to have on an average of 100 percent assistance. The singular thing about that is that on an examination of the census data you will find there are about 40,000 male Indians over the age of 35. So it would appear that if this amount is reduced and prorated over the heads of families, almost every male Indian over 35 in the United States is getting some kind of assistance. That is not very eloquent and persuasive testimony to the work that has been done in the Indian Bureau. It occurs to me that that item should be cut, because I honestly believe there must be abuse there somewhere if these figures stack up. You cannot make anything else out of it.

A portion of this money of course goes to rehabilitation funds. They originally estimated \$425,000 for that purpose. Sewing and canning projects, water development, land development, buildings, barns, and chicken houses. They even built 41 garages and sheds out of that money in the last few years. That may be rehabilitation, but when you build a garage it presumes an automobile, and when you drive an automobile it certainly does not presume need.

Among other things, they set up five laundries in the last 4 or 5 years. They built 2,482 new houses. They repaired 4,540 other houses out of this rehabilitation fund. It is no difficult matter, I suppose, to get a bushel basket and fill it with a million dollars and just go about and broadcast this money, notwithstanding all the tearful appeals you have heard about Indian homes with dirt floors. I have been in some of them in the Osage capital and I have been in some of them in South Dakota when I used to sell books to the farmers to get enough money with which to go back to school. It seems to me if we are going to

be consistent in our attitude on this W. P. A. money, we will have to reduce the W. P. A. for the Indians as well. Take some of them off of the pay roll. When they tell us there are 35,000 who are on part-time relief and 25,000 on an average of 100 percent, it means that the equivalent of 50 or 60 or more percent of the male Indians over 35 years of age have been getting some kind of relief. How does that stack up with the recommendation in the report, about men who are going into the Army and finding their way into some productive industry? The committee recognizes that fact itself when they said in their report that they are of the opinion that war expenditures should open up means of obtaining employment to many Indians, and that this form of relief expenditure should be reduced to the minimum. If that means what I think it means, and in view of the fact that this appropriation does not become effective until July 1, 1943, you can well afford to support this amendment and reduce the amount from \$1,000,000 to \$500,000.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNS. I think it is proposed to cut the W. P. A. appropriations at least 50 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the slightest doubt about it.

Mr. JOHNS. And in addition to that it is proposed to cut out entirely the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. If we do that, then it would not be any more than fair that you should cut this down 50 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin takes a reasonable view of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This item of \$1,000,000 is for two vital purposes. It is for relief and rehabilitation. The relief feature is to take care of people who are unemployable—the sick, the aged, the crippled. They cannot be employed. Another thing, your relief is going to become more intense among the Indians in the future than it has been in the past because the C. C. C. activities are sharply cut down. Likewise, the N. Y. A. and also the W. P. A., which furnished an avenue of work for some of these Indians, will now, in the main, be closed to them; consequently the relief factor will be higher, and, as I said a moment ago, more intense in the future than it has been in the past.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Is it not true that with Indian men having to go to war and other Indians having to go so far to get work in industry, it leaves a great many women on relief, and that nothing will take care of them except direct relief? These are the most needy people in the whole country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman because she is just 100 percent right. I want now to refer to the question of rehabilitation. In the Great Plains country thousands of Indians

still live in tents and in crude houses almost totally devoid of shelter. During the long drought period we have gone through the Indians lost over 50,000 head of cattle. In the drought section of the western country, like Montana, the Dakotas, and Wyoming, the Indians were almost cleaned of cattle, and this rehabilitation amount, which is 40 percent of the million dollars, or only \$400,000, is going to be used for the purpose of purchasing cattle, livestock, and equipment with which the Indians will be able to take care of themselves. This item, Mr. Chairman, should not be cut a dime, as a matter of fact, it is much below what it has been heretofore. In 1939 it was \$1,240,000, in 1941 it was \$1,600,000, and in 1942 it is only \$723,000. So you can see it has been markedly cut down by the committee.

The chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee handling this bill is perhaps more familiar with Indian affairs than any man in this House. I refer to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. I think he has done an excellent job for the taxpayers of this country in cutting down this bill in every way in which it could be cut down. At the same time he and his committee have not overlooked the fact that we owe a duty to the Indian because he has involuntarily been subjected to the state of ward of the United States Government. He is our ward. You are not going to treat your wards in a different way than you would treat your neighbor across the street. The Government, if anything, owes these Indians something higher and beyond what we owe to each other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from Montana that this item has already been reduced from the \$1,700,000 carried in the bill 2 years ago to \$1,000,000 in this bill for the fiscal year 1943, the bill now under consideration. It has been cut \$700,000, and the committee thought this was a pretty drastic reduction. There are still a lot of unemployed Indians, especially amongst the older Indians whose lands, in many instances, have been practically taken away from them by the Government of the United States when, several years ago, many incompetent Indians were given what was called force patents by this Government. That is one of the dark pages in American history. Then, of course, in most other instances the Government has to take the lands in trust for the Indians.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is correct. In other words, most of the Indians do not own any land at all. The United States Government holds title to the land in trust for the Indians. The Indian has not anything. His reservations have been taken away from him, and in lieu of that the Government has given him a deed of trust; and in many instances, just as the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota pointed out, these people are living in direst and abject poverty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Instead of "\$500,000", insert "\$750,000." Instead of "\$22,500", insert "\$30,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this is a small item. My amendment recognizes the principle that savings should be made but is not quite so drastic as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I wonder if we cannot agree on a compromise between the committee figure and the gentleman's amendment, if we cannot meet the difference half way?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say that I personally would be agreeable to the compromise on condition that there is general agreement among the others that it is satisfactory. Otherwise I shall have to insist on a vote.

Mr. HULL. I think there are those on the floor who would object to either procedure.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment very much in order, and the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois perfectly proper.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have talked this over with several Members. As I say, we recognize that there is considerable sentiment for making a substantial cut on this item. It is argued that some of the Indian boys who were formerly in the reservations are now in the armed forces and are getting some pay. In some places a few of the Indians have obtained work in defense projects. That is not a large number, but admittedly it bears on the problem when we are all putting the war first. Yet I feel the gentleman's amendment goes too far. I am hoping that agreement can be reached on the compromise.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean on this paragraph?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, we are all anxious to economize. I am anxious to economize. The difficulty is that we cannot all agree on just where economy ought to start. I happen to have a large band of Winnebago Indians in my district. They live only a few miles from my town, and I am quite familiar with their mode of life and with their very aggravated situation.

This tribe of Indians, had the white man kept his treaties with them, would

today own at least five counties in north-eastern Iowa which were granted to them in perpetuity, over 100 years ago, "forever and ever"—the white man's usual language.

Today the remnants of that tribe are living on submarginal land about 5 miles from my city. They have a little settlement there of probably 300 people altogether, maybe more. Others are scattered throughout that section of Wisconsin. They have been deprived of everything that their ancestors had by the Federal agencies of our country. At one time there was established a trust fund for those Indians of \$490,000. A number of years ago, more than 20 years, a law passed the Congress allowing division of that trust fund among those Indians. Agents went out from the Federal bureau and they squandered that money on every scheme that could be imagined, investing the funds in properties which soon were lost and leaving the Indians worse off than ever, leaving those Indians without a dollar.

Many of these Indians are now living in wigwams up there in cold Wisconsin, and it is especially cold there in the wintertime. We have a little school for them. This beneficent Government gives each school child a little bowl of soup, a half pint of milk, and a meager lunch, up in that great dairy country, every school day for 8 months of the year. That is a part of the relief funds which is proposed by this amendment to reduce.

Those people are sending their young men into this war. I happen to know of some of them. One is a marine down at Quantico and the other one is down in South Carolina. Still others are in other Army camps. They are making wonderful soldiers, just as they did in the World War. But at home are the old, the blind, the maimed, and the sick, and they are living under very destitute circumstances.

If you cut this amount down, what are you doing? You are going to compel some of those more destitute Indians to subsist more largely upon the taxpayers of our country, or else you are going to permit them to starve.

Let me call your attention to another angle of economy "as is." You people who want to save money in gobs instead of in dribblets should realize that in a single 10 months our country sent to the people of Spain 200,000 tons of foodstuffs. We are sending thousands of tons of foodstuffs today to the French in Africa and to the French colonies in another part of Africa. Those nations are not our allies. In other words, we are feeding the poor and the needy in other sections of the world. Are you going to start economy in Federal expenditures by starving the poor Indian children and the poor old Indian folks out in the Middle West? I am not going to do that. This amendment should be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 47, noes 12.

So the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as amended by the substitute.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois was amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota; so what we are voting on now, as I understand it, is to confirm or approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois as amended by the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 45, noes 11.

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Reindeer service: For supervision of reindeer in Alaska and instruction in the care and management thereof, including salaries and travel expenses of employees, purchase, rental, erection, and repair of range cabins, purchase and maintenance of communication and other equipment, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses, \$91,160, to be immediately available, and to remain available until June 30, 1944.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana has been recognized.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to this paragraph.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, are not committee members going to be entitled to recognition when they are on their feet asking for recognition? I make the point of order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I was on my feet before any member of the committee was on his feet.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was on his feet at the same time.

Mr. RICH. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman was sitting down when I was on my feet.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I was sitting here beside the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I want to assure the Chair that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was on his feet seeking recognition.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not at the time I got recognition.

Mr. CARTER. At the conclusion of the reading of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Montana, but the Chair thinks he should yield at this time. The Chair had recognized him.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], for whom I have the greatest admiration, I want to correct a statement I made before today.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman from Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is speaking out of order and has not received the permission of the Committee to speak out of order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am speaking in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With reference to the amount that William Penn paid the Indians, I said this morning that he paid the Indians \$250.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that I am in order.

Mr. CARTER. I ask that his amendment be reported.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The amendment was to strike out the last word.

Mr. COCHRAN. What is the last word?

Mr. O'CONNOR. About the reindeer.

Mr. CARTER. The last word is "1944."

Mr. O'CONNOR. It referred to the reindeer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order and confine his remarks to the paragraph.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In connection with the bill and in connection with the Indian problem, and in connection with the whole matter, I want to correct what I stated to the distinguished gentleman this morning as to the amount that William Penn paid to the Indians. I stated it was \$250.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DITTER. I asked for the point of order so that if there is any confusion at the moment with reference to whatever my distinguished friend from Montana is saying, I hope the objection is withdrawn and that he is permitted every possible latitude to elaborate on the thought he had earlier in the day.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to waive any right I have to make the point of order, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He is not waiving my right to make a point of order here in this manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. On page 5757 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1937, is a copy of the deed given by the Indians to William Penn, covering what is now the entire State of Pennsylvania, but no money is mentioned except 300 guilders, Dutch coins worth in our money about 41 cents each. Rum, beer, knives,

fishhooks, and so forth, and some clothing, were mentioned. The value of the articles set forth in the deed I do not find mentioned. I ask the gentleman to read that deed. It is a historic document.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I think it is very unfortunate that during the course of the consideration of this bill we should intrude this matter with reference to one single State. May I remind the gentleman, who is making a historical review, that William Penn was the one man who made a treaty with the Indians that was not under seal, that it was the only treaty that was never broken, and that Lord Chesterfield himself, in his letters to his son, commented particularly on the treatment accorded the Indians by William Penn. I do not care to detain the House any further on a subject that I know is so self-evident that it needs no elaboration.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I gladly admit that William Penn was the first in America in authority to recognize the ownership of land in the Indians. He recognized it when he bought this land from the Indians. But I repeat that they took the lands away from the Indians without any consideration whatever except a lot of inexpensive articles of personal property. I do not reflect at all upon the great State of Pennsylvania. The occasion is simply typical of how the Indians have been dealt with.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 53, line 17, change the period to a colon and insert: "Provided, That not less than \$40,000 of said amount be used for exterminating wolves and coyotes."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments prepared. One is to reduce this item of \$91,160. However, after talking to the Delegate from Alaska, and in view of the evidence that was given in the committee to the effect that the handling of the reindeer situation in Alaska has been a failure, I wish to change the amendment. Just let me give you a few facts.

Several years ago, as you know, a bill was passed here to appropriate \$2,500,000 to purchase the reindeer that were owned by certain corporations in Alaska. After a round-up and fighting this bill, the Interior Department did a good job. I congratulate them, because they bought all the reindeer in Alaska from these corporations for \$720,000. As they figured, they got 84,000 reindeer for \$720,000. Then we appropriated \$91,000 to herd these reindeer.

Let me read from page 161 of the justifications:

There are now about 50,000 Government-owned reindeer in Alaska, including 6,000 due from native owners. These reindeer are worth \$866,250 on the basis of the present wholesale price of 15½ cents per pound.

As funds to finance an effective herding program have not been provided, 10,000 to 20,000 Government-owned reindeer have been killed by wolves, or died of starvation and exhaustion during the 12 months following purchase.

Now, does it not seem ridiculous for them to claim that 20,000 of these reindeer died during that one particular year, when that was the first year we ever spent \$91,000 to look after them?

I want to make this further statement, and I believe I am correct when I say that all of the members of the committee feel that the purchase of these reindeer has been a failure. But whoever has charge of this matter is trying to herd these reindeer and keep the wolves and coyotes away from them. The only way you are ever going to provide an additional amount of reindeer meat in Alaska is to get rid of the wolves and coyotes, because they kill from 1 to 10 a night. So let us stop herding the reindeer, and kill the coyotes and wolves.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder if these wolves and coyotes do not carry guns, or at least a lot of them.

Mr. RICH. Certainly, the hunters kill some. In my opinion, we are not handling this reindeer situation properly. If you adopt this amendment it will provide about \$40,000 for getting rid of the coyotes and wolves, and this will do more to save the reindeer than to have a lot of people in that vast territory trying to herd them together.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. May I invite the attention of the gentleman to the fact that although \$720,000 was appropriated to purchase the reindeer owned by others than natives of Alaska, only about \$446,000 was actually used for that purpose, and the remaining amount of \$274,000 was not paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. RICH. After the fight we had I want to give the Department of the Interior credit because they certainly did a good job in making that purchase. Mr. Ickes, Mr. Burlew, and others. I congratulate them upon that.

The Delegate from Alaska has seen fit to try to help exterminate these wolves, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] claims, if I understand him correctly, that they kill from 1 to 10 reindeer a night, and that is the best way to increase the number of reindeer. Therefore, if you adopt this policy the Department will then see that at least \$40,000 of this money is spent for the extermination of the wolves and coyotes. So I hope the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman think he should include the hunters also?

Mr. RICH. If the hunters were brought there to kill the wolves and the coyotes that would help a great deal in extinguishing the wolves.

Mr. JENSEN. They are more apt to kill the reindeer than the wolves or the coyotes.

Mr. RICH. Let us kill both the wolves and the coyotes, and let each hunter have one reindeer, and we can increase our herd very rapidly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Members may recall that over a period of several years I opposed the proposal to purchase reindeer in Alaska, both before the Committee and on the floor of the House. It will also be recalled that at first it was proposed to spend \$2,000,000 to buy the reindeer. The proposal was presented to the House on three separate occasions, and I opposed it each time it came up. I also opposed it actively in the committee. I remember the gentleman from New York opposed it very bitterly. Finally, there was a compromise worked out whereby a bill was passed authorizing \$750,000 for the purchase of some 250,000 reindeer and equipment. When the reindeer were counted, it was discovered that there were only 84,000 for which the Interior Department paid only \$450,000, and this sum included funds for the purchase of range improvements, and there were a lot of improvements of considerable value involved.

The Government now has invested \$450,000, and there are now estimated to be 250,000 reindeer all told in Alaska. Reindeer meat is a primary food among the Eskimos and the Indians of Alaska. Its importance to the economic stability of Alaska cannot be overemphasized. If Congress, figuratively speaking, throws up its hands now and says, "We will have nothing further to do with it; it is a failure, and we are sorry about it, although we have \$450,000 invested in Alaskan reindeer," then most of the reindeer will be exterminated by wolves or coyotes in the next year or two. I do not feel that it is the desire of Congress that situation be permitted to solve itself in any such fashion.

The question now is, What are we going to do about it? I am sure the Congress wants to handle the matter in the best way possible. I do not think Congress wants to eliminate the entire matter. The suggestion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a suggestion that I made to the officials of the Department of the Interior when the matter came before the committee.

It will be recalled that I asked them in some detail about spending a goodly portion of this money for the trapping of coyotes and wolves, and the Department officials who happened to be there opposed it. Mr. Cooley, who has been in charge of agriculture for the Indians and has done a swell job, has now been placed in charge of the reindeer situation in Alaska, and he has consistently done a good job wherever he has gone. I do not pretend to say that a good job has been done in connection with this reindeer matter during the past year, but it does seem reasonable to suggest that

Mr. Cooley ought to be given an opportunity to build up this herd of reindeer in Alaska. We must do something about it. We cannot afford to permit this to be a failure. If it is necessary to spend additional funds for the trapping and killing coyotes and wolves, I shall not hesitate to urge that be done.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Was it not stated in the committee that the greatest reason for the killing of these animals is because of the infestation of the country by wolves?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure that is one of the main reasons; there are others. I think they must have herders if we are going to protect the interests that we have in Alaska.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the opinion of the Delegate from Alaska in respect to this amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would be very glad to have the gentleman answer that question. The gentleman came before our committee, and his advice and counsel are always sought by our committee. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to abide by his suggestions in the matter.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The subject that is now under discussion is one which is not only of great concern to the people of Alaska, but if the people of the United States generally knew about it, it would be of almost equal concern to them, because it relates to the use of about 200,000 square miles of land in Alaska which is more suitable for reindeer pasture than for anything else. To get the picture it is necessary for me to recite briefly some of the history of bringing reindeer to Alaska and of their maintenance there. We started with a "seed crop" of only 1,280 reindeer. They were brought to Alaska in installments between 1892 and 1902. Over the years that number increased, and, for most of the time under careful and assiduous herding by the Eskimos, it reached the number estimated, according to testimony in the hearings, of 641,000.

The herds grew from 1,280 to 640,000 in something less than 40 years. Then, through a combination of circumstances not necessary to go into, because it would take a long time, herding was discontinued upon the invitation of the Government, and so the wolves and coyotes multiplied, and there was some other illicit killing, and thus the herds were seriously depleted. The result is, we are told now, that there are only 205,000 reindeer in Alaska. Much of the difficulty arose through the purchase of reindeer by the white men and the conflict between the interests of the Eskimos and the whites; and Congress, in my judgment, in a statesmanlike manner, attempted to solve that by buying out all of the white men's reindeer and providing that the Eskimos from that time on should have and use and own all of the live reindeer.

That purchase was completed about a year and a half ago. In the meantime, since herding was discontinued, the wolves and the coyotes have increased to such large numbers that it has not been possible yet to kill enough of them off to prevent them from killing vast numbers of the reindeer. It would be a tragedy to discontinue this work of protecting and caring for the reindeer, and I hope that the House will not eliminate the appropriation altogether or reduce it to some insignificant sum like \$11,000, as has been suggested, or reduce it at all. At the same time, I must admit that I believe that the first thing to be done by the Government is to kill the coyotes and wolves, for then the reindeer will multiply as they did between 1900 and 1930, and if that is done the time is not so many years distant when we will have a million reindeer in Alaska, and they will again be an important source of food and clothing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure that the members of the committee, and every Member of the House, have implicit confidence in the Delegate from Alaska and in his sincerity of purpose and desire to assist in this very important situation. I am wondering if the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be willing to withdraw his first amendment.

Mr. RICH. Oh, the first amendment I asked to have withdrawn, and I am only asking that we allocate \$40,000 of this to the killing of these wolves and coyotes. As the Delegate said, that is the best way to help the reindeer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment if the Delegate thinks that it is desirable. I am willing to do that, or if it should be determined any other way, then I am satisfied with that—say a division of 50-50.

Mr. RICH. We ask for only \$40,000 for that purpose, and I think it would help the reindeer situation very much.

Mr. DIMOND. It is entirely feasible at moderate expense to so reduce the numbers of wolves and coyotes in the reindeer regions that the reindeer will be again able to thrive and multiply. While some of the reindeer live in timbered country which affords shelter to the wolves and other wild animals, by far the greater number of them, perhaps 90 percent, graze in open country and never enter the timber. Thousands upon thousands of square miles of the reindeer pastures contain no timber whatsoever. During the winter season, when snow is on the ground, both reindeer and wolves can be readily seen from the air. I have flown over a reindeer herd consisting of some thousands of animals, and at one side of the herd, perhaps a quarter of a mile away, were three wolves readily visible from the air. At that moment it occurred to me that the way of eliminating the wolves and coyotes in Alaska was to hunt them with the use of airplanes. It would be impossible for these predatory animals to escape. Many wolves have been killed by hunters in airplanes using

only shotguns and rifles. One can readily see that by equipping a plane with a machine gun it would be possible in a year or two to kill practically all the wolves in the reindeer country.

Some of them would, of course, escape, but the numbers could be so reduced that their depredations upon the reindeer herds would be insignificant, as was the case between 1900 and 1925 when the reindeer increased from 1,280 to more than half a million in number. At that time, the number of wolves in Alaska was relatively insignificant because for most of that period the reindeer were herded continuously day and night, and the herders were able to kill practically all the wolves which approached their herds. In those former days, too, there were no coyotes in Alaska. They came in in the 1920's, but they have increased prodigiously in number and are now said to be as destructive as the wolves.

As has been suggested by a question asked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] there has been some unlawful hunting and killing of reindeer, but the loss to the herds which occur in this manner has been of no material consequence.

The reindeer herds can be rebuilt not only to their former number but, in my judgment, to more than double that number. There is no reason in the world why Alaska cannot support in perpetuity a million reindeer unless it is considered the reindeer pasture is more valuable for other purposes. But in order to reestablish the herds and to so increase them, it is necessary, first, that the reindeer be herded as they were in the early days by the Eskimos, to some extent under Government supervision; that the tundra fires be prevented or kept under control because millions of acres of excellent reindeer pasture have already been destroyed by such fires; and, above and beyond all else, that the present enormous stock of wolves and coyotes in Alaska be hunted down and killed.

While it will never be possible to kill all the wolves and coyotes in Alaska, they can be kept under control so they will do comparatively little damage. In this connection, I suggest that a greater effort should be made to slaughter all the wolves and coyotes that can be found in Mount McKinley National Park. For many years they enjoyed in that area complete protection, and only in the last 3 or 4 years have orders been given to kill wolves in the park whenever they were encountered. It is my understanding that from three to seven wolves and coyotes have been killed each year in the park for several years past. A determined effort should be made to kill every wolf and every coyote in Mount McKinley National Park, as well as elsewhere in Alaska.

In this connection it is worthy of note that the Territorial government pays a bounty of \$17.50 each on wolves and coyotes, and the hunters keep the pelts. This is a considerable drain on the Territorial treasury, but the Legislature of Alaska has thought it justified because without such a bounty the destruction of these predatory animals on the other wildlife

of Alaska would be even more appalling than it is. The Territory is really doing its part in paying this considerable bounty on wolves and coyotes.

The reindeer are really of more value than most people know. Not only is the meat truly excellent but the reindeer skins, with the hair left on, make the warmest garments of which I have any knowledge. They are invaluable for use as coats and parkas and particularly as sleeping bags, combining warmth with lightness.

The reindeer should be distributed more widely over Alaska, and particularly in the Aleutian Islands. From the hearings it will be seen that the reindeer now on St. Lawrence Island and Nunivak Island, some thousands in number, multiply and thrive because no wolf or coyote is to be found on either of those islands. The Reindeer Service should, at the earliest possible moment, also stock a number of other islands of Alaska, especially Unalaska Island and Umnak Island, the former, perhaps, 75 miles long and 20 miles wide, and the latter at least 50 miles long and 15 miles wide. These islands could easily support a great many thousands of reindeer and would be of immense benefit to the natives of that region. Many other areas in Alaska could be similarly so stocked, and they should be so stocked, with reindeer at the earliest possible moment. I realize that at the present time the serious lack of shipping for all purposes would prevent the transportation of reindeer by sea for any considerable distance.

As was suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], the United States Government has a distinct and substantial stake in the maintenance and protection of the Alaska reindeer. As was indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], \$720,000 was appropriated by Congress for the purpose of buying the Alaska reindeer owned by others than the natives of Alaska in 1939. Of this sum, approximately \$446,000 was used for the purchase of the reindeer and of reindeer range equipment, and the balance, amounting to about \$274,000, was not used and remained in the Treasury. The history of this transaction was set forth by the late great Hon. Edward T. Taylor, then chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, in his remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 1, 1940. But even if the Government did not even have a cent invested in reindeer, it would still be the part of wisdom to protect and preserve the reindeer as a present and future food supply of Alaska, and in case of need of the Nation, and as the source of supply of clothing for military personnel and civilians for winter use in cold climates. To now abandon the reindeer would be short-sighted, indeed, because we know by past experience that under proper conditions Alaska can support so many hundreds of thousands of these valuable animals that they would constitute a real asset not only to Alaska but to the Nation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the gentleman's opinion as to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to allot \$40,000 of this amount to the killing of the wolves and coyotes?

Mr. DIMOND. I hesitate to give a categorical answer to the gentleman, because I do not want to come into conflict with the Interior Department and with other people who are just as earnest and just as intelligent as I am, and just as desirous of saving the reindeer of Alaska. But if I were the administrator and had the disposal of the fund of \$91,000 in the bill I think I would spend at least \$40,000 of it to kill the coyotes and the wolves. I think, thereby, I would do the best possible thing to permit the reindeer to multiply and be thus sufficient to supply the needs of Alaska.

I do not want to be in the position of accepting this amendment or saying that I favor it, because I still believe that Mr. Cooley, of the Department of the Interior, mentioned by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], probably understands the condition just as well as I do, but he does not want to spend so much money for killing the wolves and the coyotes as I would. I should, on that account, desire to have this appropriation go through as written, but it would be better to adopt the amendment than to reduce the appropriation for care of the reindeer. At the same time I believe that the extermination of the wolves and coyotes is absolutely necessary to save the reindeer.

Let me tell you about the wolves and coyotes. They are more terrible than people realize. I talked with some Eskimos who at one time had a large reindeer herd in Alaska, in 1933. They told me that their herds had numbered a good many thousand and had finally been reduced to about 11,000. I asked the cause of it. They said the wolves killed them. I said, "Did the wolves eat all of those reindeer in the course of the winter?"

The Eskimo explained to me—he did not use this language, but he said, in effect, that the wolves are fussy about their diet—the wolves are epicures concerning their food. As long as they can get reindeer tongue they will eat nothing but the tongue. They will kill a reindeer and eat its tongue; then they will kill another reindeer and eat its tongue; and another one; and so on. The Eskimos in charge of this particular herd told me that they had lost more than 100 reindeer out of their herd in one night to one pair of wolves. So the wolves are an awful scourge to the reindeer, and unless the wolves and coyotes are controlled there is not much use appropriating money to the reindeer service. The wolves and coyotes can be controlled, if not exterminated. That job should be done without delay. Moreover, the reindeer must be herded; that, too, is indispensable. The tundra fires should be prevented. The reindeer should be distributed widely over Alaska and particu-

larly on the islands. That is a sound program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, after hearing the statement of the Delegate from Alaska, as far as the committee is concerned, we will gladly accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and give the trappers an opportunity to show us what they can do. This Government has too much invested and reindeer meat is entirely too essential to the natives to permit our herds in Alaska to become extinct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am wondering what the chairman of the subcommittee is going to do about this? I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that we had an agreement earlier in the afternoon, and I am sure he was not on the floor at the time, in which I stated that, in conjunction with the chairman of the subcommittee, we would object to requests to speak out of order. We are endeavoring to finish this bill today. We are going to have to sit late in order to do it. It is a long bill. I trust the gentleman will withdraw his request at this time, because I stated on the floor some hours ago that we would have to confine the arguments this afternoon to the bill under consideration.

Mr. NICHOLS. I have only used 10 minutes' time on this bill in 2 days. I think I am going to address myself to something that is quite important. I have reduced it to writing so that I will not be wandering around and so that I can get it off with precision.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman always makes an interesting statement. Had I not made that statement I would be glad to cooperate.

Mr. NICHOLS. I hope the gentleman will not object. It was not necessary for me to ask to speak out of order. I could have just gone ahead and done it.

Mr. CARTER. I might ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he desires to set aside that rule and allow Members to speak out of order. If he does, I am not going to object to setting aside that rule, but I think we ought to preserve the integrity of that understanding for this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, a liberal ruling will let the gentleman go ahead anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There was such an agreement earlier and I have asked other members who have spoken to me about it to wait until later in the day. I have said that if we are able to finish this bill by 5 o'clock, which

I think it would be possible to do and which we are making a strong effort to do, that I would then be glad to revise and modify that agreement. Of course, I cannot object to the gentleman. I never have done so.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he would withhold his request for the present and renew it a little later.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman been granted any time at the present time?

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, the gentleman has been recognized, I understand.

Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my request and renew it at a later time, and will address myself to a different subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his request. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this morning one of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], took the floor and questioned some of the statements I made on yesterday relative to a bid submitted by the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. for power to furnish Camp Gruber in my district. I understand that he said a bid of 5 mills per kilowatt-hour was not submitted by the Grand River Dam Authority, but that it was 7.2 mills. I am sure my friend was trying to straighten out what he thought was a misunderstanding, but my friend was incorrect.

The prime bid of the Grand River Dam Authority was 5 mills. What brought it to 7.2 mills was the line charge that would be made by the Grand River Dam Authority in delivering the power to Camp Gruber. I am not advised whether or not in the 10.8 mills bid by the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. the line charge was included, but for the sake of the argument let us agree that it was. There would still be a difference of 3.6 mills between the two bids. In this connection this morning I again called on the Army engineers and asked who it was in the War Production Board they talked to who advised them that they should give the bid to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. at the higher figure. A general in the Corps of Army Engineers advised me that it was a man by the name of Mr. Kahler. I called Mr. Kahler on the telephone. He said, "No; I never advised them. I never heard anything about it at all until this moment." I said, "Will you send me a letter to this effect?" He said, "I will"; and I presume that letter is now in the mails to reach my office this afternoon.

I was further advised that the reason the bid was given to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. was because it was said that if the bid were given to the Grand River Dam Authority, the Grand River Dam Authority would have to have priorities on material, so the bid was given to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.; and then, after the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. got the bid, they had to have, and did get,

priorities on exactly the same materials that the Grand River Dam Authority would have had to have had the Grand River Dam Authority got the contract at the lower bid. I still say that there is a lot of funny business in it. I have never seen as much ball-passing in my life as there has been on this. Nobody will agree that he did anything. He just "passes the buck" to somebody.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last night's Evening Star carried an Associated Press dispatch which confirms what the gentleman from Oklahoma has said. In this article it states that General Manager Douglas Wright, of the Grand River Dam Authority, charges that the War Department consistently refuses to use this power for defense projects. The article goes on to quote him as saying:

I have done my best to accomplish what the President wanted me to do; that was to make the Grand River power work for national defense. Apparently it cannot be done. It is impossible for me to get a contract with the Army.

I do not know anything about this or why the Army has taken this attitude, but I do know that the Army engineers are insisting that we commit ourselves to \$87,500,000 for power projects in Arkansas and southwest Missouri. I refer to the Bull Shoals and Table Rock projects which you will have a chance to vote on tomorrow. What is the use of the Government putting up power projects if the Army is not going to use them for defense purposes? That is what the sponsors say they want them for. They have the Norfolk Dam that is being constructed now that will furnish power. Why have two additional ones in the neighborhood and commit this Government to the expenditure of \$87,500,000 when the Army refuses to use the power? At least that is what the paper said and what the gentleman from Oklahoma said—the Army refuses to use it for national defense purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that constructive criticism? I think it is.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think it is constructive criticism.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do, too.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then what is the gentleman hollering about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not hollering, as the gentleman terms my remarks. I just want to get it in the Record that it is constructive, so we can use it on the Democrats when they yell that similar remarks made by Republicans are sniping.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman should be able to judge. He knows I am always constructive.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am able to judge. What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] have just said is constructive. Unfortunately, whenever like statements are made by others they are accused of partisanship—of playing politics.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wisconsin: Keshena, \$78,525, including \$25,000, of which not exceeding \$5,000 shall be available for general relief purposes and not exceeding \$20,000 for monthly allowances, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, to old and indigent members of the Menominee Tribe who reside with relatives or friends: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available from the funds of the Menominee Indians for the payment of salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreters of the Menominee general council and members of the Menominee Advisory Council and tribal delegates when engaged on business of the tribe at rates to be determined by the Menominee general council and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 55, line 7, strike out "\$78,525" and insert "\$83,725." And in line 8, after the word "which" insert: "\$5,200 shall be available for compensation and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys employed by the tribe under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior and".

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which increases the amount stipulated in this paragraph by the sum of \$5,200, but it is an amendment that does not cost the Treasury of the United States one single penny. I hope I may have the attention of the Members, because I consider this to be a rather important amendment from the standpoint of these Indians.

This amendment relates to the right of the Menominee Tribe, in Wisconsin, to employ in the protection of its own business its own counsel, to be paid for out of its own funds. The Menominee Indian Tribe has over \$1,500,000 to their credit at the present time in cash in the Treasury of the United States. They have over \$5,000,000 worth of other assets, among which are their sawmills at Keshena, Wis., which employ hundreds of Indians, has a large annual pay roll, and is doing a very large business at the present time. This year it will show a net profit to the Indians of over \$150,000.

Their interests are frequently adverse to those of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Their sawmill and all their logging operations are conducted under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I think it should be perfectly obvious to any honest man that there are times without number—and, without going into detail, I can say now that there are occasions when the interests of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior are absolutely adverse to the rights of the Indians. There is a dispute pending at the present time, for instance, over the management of this sawmill operation by the manager appointed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They have continually lost money, and the Indians claim that the sawmills should have made a large profit. They want their own counsel to handle their own affairs, to be paid out of their own funds. Why, in the name of conscience, the committee

should have stricken this item from the bill is beyond my wildest imagination.

This item was in the bill recommended by the President and by the Budget. The committee has stricken it out, and the only justification appearing in the report is that they have adopted a general attitude of refusing counsel to the Indians of their own choice throughout the entire country and are compelling the Indians to accept their legal advice from the attorneys of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior. So when a question arises as between this tribe, involving their own property and their own affairs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior, they have not a dollar of funds with which they can employ their own counsel to represent them, but must be represented by counsel for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If you can justify that sort of conduct, then it seems to me you are denying these wards of the Government, who are citizens of the United States, the inherent right that exists in every citizen that in matters involving his interest he has the right to be represented in litigation or in matters of business by attorneys of his own choosing.

Bear in mind we are not asking the Government for any money. We are simply asking to be permitted to spend our own funds in the sum of \$5,200. The tribal council of the Menominee Tribe has engaged counsel, the same counsel that have represented them for a number of years very satisfactorily. They want to employ these attorneys and have unanimously voted in their tribal council for the appropriation of these funds. Why should they not be entitled to use their own money for this purpose? The contract which they enter into is subject to the approval of the Department of the Interior.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have checked into this matter. While these Indians are not in my district, I know a great many of them. They are splendid people, and they are doing a fine business. I have undertaken to advise them, and I have seen to it that they have had proper legal representation. They have accepted my advice. This is not a situation where some buccaneers are trying to steal the money of the Indians. The representation which they have is the very highest type of legal representation and the Indians want it.

Their attorneys, last year, spent 123 days working on the affairs of these Indians, besides handling a large number of personal injury actions, and a large number of workmen's compensation cases that have arisen through the operation of the sawmill on the Indian reservation.

Mr. CREAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. If this should be allowed and the amendment should carry, would it go to services claimed to have been performed or for services yet to be performed?

Mr. KEEFE. It will go for services to be performed under contract to be entered into by the tribal council and the attorney, to be approved by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The thought has arisen in my mind as follows: Suppose the counsel for the Indians clashes with the counsel for the Interior Department, which one prevails?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot say who prevails except that the Indians are entitled to representation. There are constantly matters arising as between these Indians. For instance, this committee has approved an item of over \$6,000 to pay the expenses of the tribal representatives who come down here to Washington every year in the interest of this tribe and in their dealings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. My experience has been since I became a Member of Congress that those people immediately are represented and guided and directed by counsel for the Indian Bureau. They need their own counsel to advise them in their dealings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Let me call your attention to another thing. You observe in the report that the committee says:

In connection with funds provided in the estimate for the employment of agents or attorneys for the purposes of rendering assistance to the tribes, the committee has recommended the elimination of all such requests, and it is the opinion of the committee that legal assistance and other aid should be available to the Indians from attorneys and other employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

At least the committee, in providing legal assistance to the three tribes in Oklahoma, apparently did not follow that policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There is not an authorization in this bill for any contract attorney. That is an altogether different situation.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know anything about that, but I can say that in the bill there is provision for attorneys' fees, stenographers, and office expenses for attorneys for three tribes of Indians, the Choctaws, the Chickasaws, and the Osages, in the gentleman's State of Oklahoma. That is clearly in this bill. Anyone who can read can find it there. I submit that if anyone who has the bill in his hands will turn to that page, I

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not mean to tell the House that the Choctaws and the Chickasaws and the other Indians who employ their own Indian attorneys and have employed them for the last 25 years have attorneys who are in the same category as the contract attorneys who in many

cases—possibly not in this case; I agree that it is not the same in this case—run down to the different tribes and say, "The Government of the United States owes you money. Just hire us and we will collect millions of dollars from the Government." That is what our committee was getting at.

Mr. KEEFE. If I thought for one moment that there was any such thing as that involved in this request I would not be here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. As far as I am concerned, they are only asking to do the ordinary legal affairs for this tribe, the same as the attorneys are doing down in Oklahoma, and the same as they have done for years. I do not see how you can make fish of one and fowl of the other.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I take the floor of the House, especially to oppose the members of this committee, with whom I have worked and for whose judgment and integrity I have the highest respect. However, this is a matter that I think goes to fundamental principles. I may say to the House that I have no interest at all in these Indians. They are not in my district. I am not involved in any way. But I have come to know just what has been done in this matter for about 4 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is stating that he is not interested. The gentleman would like to have an attorney for some Indians in whom he is interested? Is that the idea?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Not in the least. I have no Indians in my district, and I do not care anything about who is appointed or anything of that sort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will be kind enough to yield again, let me say that there is a fundamental policy, and the committee believes that that policy should be carried out.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I believe that if the committee believes that policy should exist, it then owes a duty to this House to cut out the attorneys for the three tribes of Indians in Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. A situation like that has no connection at all with this.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am willing to submit to this House whether or not it has. Let us consider the facts about this tribe of Indians. The gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has stated the facts with reference to the Wisconsin tribe. I know the facts as to another tribe of Indians, in Oregon, in the district of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], the Klamath Tribe of Indians. Attorneys have represented them for 3 or 4 years. I am personally acquainted with the attorneys who represent them. They are high-class, fine, outstanding attorneys, and they have done a good job.

Last year the attorneys for the Klamath Tribe of Indians spent 150 days on the business of these Indians, and they get \$4,500 a year. I talked to the Department to get the facts that I am stating. I talked to the assistant in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and he said that the Klamath Tribe of Indians owns in its own right \$20,000,000 worth of property, and these Indians are doing \$1,000,000 worth of business every year. They come to Washington with hundreds of problems. To show you what has been going on, this year they had \$82,000 of claims filed against them. What they ask Congress to do is this: They say, "Permit us to take from our tribal funds the funds we earn ourselves, our own funds, and employ an attorney to defend us in these particular matters." What right has the Congress to say, "You cannot do it"?

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I believe the gentleman stated that the attorneys who represent the Klamath Indians spent 150 days in serving them?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. LEAVY. Does the gentleman know if any member of that firm in the last year was out on the Klamath Reservation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; I happen to know that one of the members of the firm was out on the Klamath Reservation last year.

Mr. LEAVY. For how many days?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not know, but I know he was there. That is just a red herring to drag across the trail, and it does not mean anything, because you know and I know and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] knows, as a lawyer, that the work the attorneys for the Indians have to do is done right here in Washington. They are Washington lawyers. They did not go out and seek this job. The Indians came here. The attorneys who did this work saved the Indians, on these claims, \$82,000 this year.

Now, why should these Indians, when it comes to a matter of policy or a matter involving legal questions or a matter involving claims, be required to go to the Department of the Interior and rely entirely on the Department's lawyer? Why should they be required to do that? Is there any reason for that? Why should they not have a right to say, "We want to take our funds and hire a man that we think can represent us"?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I have always opposed this type of expenditure, and it certainly cannot be because I want to do any injury to my own profession, the law, or the lawyers. I do not challenge the good faith or the standing of the lawyers who are thus retained, but it is fundamentally wrong to spend the Indian trust funds in this manner.

I want you first to get this thought in mind. There are 200 Indian tribes in the United States, and it is a safe assertion that 75 percent of them have no funds of their own now held in trust by the United States. The 150 tribes, then, are just as much entitled to legal representation as the 50 tribes who do happen to have money, if it be sound in principle to employ private counsel to represent Indians who happen to have a cash credit in their trust account.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. No; I regret I cannot. I want to make my own statement.

I assert it is not sound in principle. Any American Indian, I do not care who he is, or where he is, can spend his money, when he wants to, for attorneys or doctors or anything else, but what they here seek to spend is not the money of any individual Indian; they are trust funds that are sought to be spent. These are funds that are put into the Treasury of the United States, and Uncle Sam, by act of Congress, is made the trustee for the Indian tribe—not the individual, but the tribe—and it is his duty, unless he breaks faith with his ward, to look after the ward's interest and not approve an action indicating on its face that Uncle Sam is not doing his part by spending tribal funds to employ additional counsel to go out and resist the things that the guardian is doing.

The Solicitor's Office in the Interior Department has dozens of lawyers. These are Government lawyers, and they are employed to represent these Indians in all trust matters just as much as where a court appoints a guardian for an incompetent and then authorizes the guardian to select an attorney and permits him to pay the attorney under the supervision of the court.

What would you think of the court if it told a ward, who is recognized, to begin with, as an incompetent, to go out and employ an attorney in addition to the one provided by the court and then that court would take out of that ward's estate the money to pay this second attorney, whose sole business it would be to do the work of the guardian and the attorney provided by him?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. LEAVY. I regret very much that I have not the time.

Mr. KEEFE. I will correct you.

Mr. LEAVY. These Indians that are mentioned here are not the only ones who happen to have some tribal funds. Six years ago there were only 2 cases where it was sought to spend money in

this manner. This year it had grown to 10 tribes that seek to spend their trust funds in this manner.

The history is, and it is a sad history, that when the Indians exhaust their tribal trust funds, then they become gratuity Indians and we are asked to provide for them out of direct appropriations made from the Federal Treasury. I have Indian tribes in my district. They are also giving heed to the alluring suggestion, that if they seek counsel like other tribes, in addition to that provided by law, that great riches can be gotten for them.

Now if there is something wrong with the Indian Bureau, if there is something wrong with the management of these Indian trust funds, let us correct it by legislation, but let us not use this method of employing private attorneys simply because there is money in the fund that can be drawn upon.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I do not have time to yield.

I want to make this further statement. Not a single attorney in the 6 years I have been on this committee has ever appeared before it and made a showing of anything except in one instance, and that was a typewritten page or two showing they had written some letters today and a letter written yesterday and another letter written a month ago.

None of these attorneys proposed to be employed represents the tribe on any pending legislation; none is retained to appear in an issue that is a justiciable issue, but they merely draw an annual salary, some of them as much as \$7,500. I know of one instance where they were drawing \$6,000 and they admitted they had never been near the Indian reservation, from which tribe they had been drawing money for year after year. I say if you adopt this amendment you do something that is fundamental, you adopt a policy that virtually says to every tribe, whether it be a pauper tribe or whether it be a tribe with \$1,000,000. You are entitled to employ attorneys, not to handle pending litigation but merely to have them on an annual retainer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 3 additional minutes so he may yield for questions.

Mr. LEAVY. My time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEEFE) there were—ayes 23, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads under the provisions of the acts of May 26, 1928 (25 U. S. C. 318a), as supplemented and amended, and September 5, 1940 (Public, No. 780), \$1,148,000 to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$10,000 of the foregoing amount may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*

further, That not to exceed \$90,000 of this appropriation shall be available for lease, construction, or repair of structures for housing road materials, supplies, and equipment, and for quarters for road crews, but the cost of any structure erected hereunder shall not exceed \$5,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 59, line 21, strike out "\$1,148,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes in a discussion of this item. Here is an item for improvement, construction, and so forth, of roads in Indian reservations amounting to \$1,148,000. I merely offer an opportunity to the committee to save \$148,000. I hope the committee will agree with me and adopt the amendment. Certainly we can reserve this road building until after the war is won.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amount has been drastically cut. It has been cut \$52,000 below the Budget estimate, and that is considerably below the amount expended last year. As stated in my opening statement with reference to this important road item, we have expended from year to year up to four or five million dollars. Only 2 or 3 years ago we spent \$4,000,000 for this item. The chairman of the Committee on Roads, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] is present in the Chamber, and will bear out the statement that for years we have kept around 10,000 to 12,000 unemployed Indians at work with this road item. The committee recognizing the fact that there are fewer unemployed Indians at this time than there were last year, has drastically reduced this item. I again remind the committee that this item has been reduced from \$4,000,000 2 years ago to \$1,148,000. It seems to me that the committee has gone a long way in offering to cooperate in the war efforts. The building of roads, after all, is an important factor in the national-defense program. I doubt whether any money to be expended in this bill would be of greater importance, in seeing to it that if necessary our troops could be transported over these roads. This money will put unemployed Indians to work, and will build roads that ought to have been built a long time ago. The committee has reduced drastically and has again reduced it, and it seems to me that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to take just a moment or two. It seems to me that the amount brought in by the Committee, \$1,148,000 for roads and bridges for the Indians might be cut this additional \$148,000, as suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. It is again a question of whether to put steel in roads, remotely disconnected from strategic necessary highways, for the transportation of our troops, or to use this construction steel to make guns and

tanks for the protection of our armed forces. True, \$148,000 would not buy very much steel, but it will be a start in that direction, and I think that Congress would be much prouder of itself, of its work in this Interior Department appropriation bill, if it can say that every time it had a chance it spent money for steel for MacArthur's forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned a few moments ago that the Chairman of the House Committee on Roads, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] is in the chamber, and now ask that gentleman this question. Is it not true that it is not proposed to spend any of this money for steel or concrete, and that this money will be used primarily for gravel roads?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is true. In fact, it is my understanding that this money will all be required for maintenance, and that no new construction can be undertaken with this greatly reduced appropriation. The funds will all be used to keep the existing Indian roads in serviceable condition and protect the investment of approximately \$30,000,000 in them. This item does so much, and it is so little for the large number of Indians benefited and the important areas served in about 25 States that I am surprised that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] would even suggest that it be cut. Some of the Indian roads are the only access to strategic war materials, and some are used extensively for the transport of troops and military supplies. Some Indian reservations are in strategic areas, near military posts and international border lines.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto be concluded in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean this amendment or this paragraph?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will be recognized within the 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this cut is only \$148,000. It makes a cut below the Budget estimate of \$200,000 out of \$1,200,000. It is a very moderate cut. It is an item for regular construction and repair of bridges and roads, and there is absolutely no reason why they cannot get along with this amount. It is more in proportion than is allowed the Bureau of Roads for construction of general highways throughout the country. I

think we ought to show common sense and adopt the amendment and cut out \$148,000 at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I realize we do not seem to accomplish very much in attempting to cut these huge figures down. This item is for \$1,148,000 and is for Indian reservation roads only. None of it outside Indian reservations. It should be cut deeper, but we are only asking that you agree to reduce it a little more than 10 percent. This is entirely separate and apart from the regular road program.

In order to tie this in to the war program they say some of these roads and trails might be used for military purposes, yet the chairman of the Roads Committee says that these roads will be gravel roads. These are not military roads at all. They are just roads and trails that have to do with these Indian reservations. These are not intended as regular military roads. You have a program that has to do with military roads separate and apart from this one.

But let us get down to brass tacks. You have got \$1,148,000. Do we not have the courage to just trim this a little bit, just 10 percent, just 10 cents out of every dollar, and save \$148,000? I agree the committee has done a fairly good job, but certainly you can go that much further. Does not \$148,000 mean anything any more? We can afford to let the construction of some of these roads go a little while and get into fighting the war a little more, then take care of the Indian roads a little later on. You have got \$1,000,000 to keep these roads in general repair. That is all you need, because you do not have the unemployment now that you had in the past. A great deal of this kind of road building was done in order to give these Indians employment. You do not have that acute unemployment problem now. Here is a chance to save a little money. Why not offer a little encouragement to the people of this country by showing a little additional economy?

As a matter of fact our citizens would be shocked if they knew this Congress was spending \$1,148,000 for repairs and bridges on Indian trails when we need the funds so much for the prosecution of the war. I just hope you will have the courage to get up and support amendments to reduce items in this bill in line with our needs and not in line with the things we would like to have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman from Oklahoma, in charge of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In my statement I said it could be used to assist in the military situation in this country. Let me give you an example. At Fort Sill, Okla., there is a gravel road that goes right up to the fort, and it is over an Indian reservation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes, but how long is that part of the road that

may be used by the Army? Not much, and that part of the road is built. Certainly will not a very great part of a million dollars do that? Besides a big fund is provided for military roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There are several such instances where a gravel road is adjacent to the fort, and therefore it could be used for military purposes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Infinitesimal, and a very small part of these Indian trails and roads will be used for military purposes. In the light of the need of funds for airplanes and guns and supplies for our fighting forces, I trust you will go along and reduce this item \$148,000. You ought to do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe in economy, but this is the worst kind of economy, to me it is wasting and throwing away previous investments. We spent hundreds of millions of dollars to build these roads and now if we cannot keep them up we will let them go to pieces and will have to rebuild them again. We talk about them being Indian trails. In my section every one of these roads that goes through an Indian reservation is used by the mail route, by the school busses, and also by the general public. Wherever a road crosses an Indian reservation, whether it is a State or a Federal road, maintenance comes out of the money appropriated for the Indian Bureau. It will force counties or States to use their meager highway income to keep these roads passable to get the mail and the children to school. We have lost practically all of our Federal aid for highways. We have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in our roads. Now we are going to let them go to pieces so that they cannot be traveled. Is that economy? I think that is the worst kind of economy. Would it be economy to build a \$15,000 home and then not spend any money to keep it in repair? We have been economizing on the rural mail routes, and I am swamped with letters, and so will the other rural Members be when the new year comes around. They are consolidating our rural routes, as much as 65 miles to one mail carrier. Our roads are going to pieces. Are not our rural people just as much entitled to service as the people in the cities? They have not foregone any of their service. The farmers out in the country can walk to town to get their mail, or they can go 2 or 3 miles to a mail box, because the mail routes have been consolidated. Where they had four or five out of one post office, now there are only one or two rural mail carriers, with routes as much as 65 miles long. That may be all right in certain sections of the country, but not in my country. With snowdrifts in winter, frost boils, and sink holes for months in spring no mail carrier can service a route over 35 miles long. That is economy, but the rural people are paying for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not true that many rural routes run through Indian reservations, but the roads are almost impassable?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Absolutely. They had crushers in there the last few years, and they have been graveled. Now, of course, if you cannot keep them up, they are bound to go to pieces—after all, \$1,000,000 scattered over thousands of miles of roads on all the Indian reservations is so little that you cannot even run over them with a road grader once a year. How are you going to keep them up? I think it is a ridiculously small amount when you figure the territory we have got to cover with \$1,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, Churchill just announces that the battle of the Atlantic is going against him, yet we are talking about appropriations for trails and roads.

I feel terribly sorry for those fellows up in Wisconsin. In my district there are five applications for every vacancy on a rural route. If one of those mail carriers does not like his job, there are five others who will take it.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry, I cannot. Listen to this from page 2954 of yesterday's Record:

Last night my own son (and the son is in the Army) was required to turn in two of the four cotton shirts issued by the Government because they did not have sufficient shirts to dress the boys in the line.

Now we are talking about building trails and roads. Down there in my own country of Allegan, Mich., they built trails along a trout stream so fishermen could get to the fish so they could be caught easier.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Who did?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That was the W. P. A., but you do the similar things up in the Indian district. I will tell you what else they did: They went out in an open field—you know these scrub-oak groves, cut-over pine land with oak openings where there are no trees—they went out there and—I will bring a picture of it over to you if you want to see it—a picture where they built brush piles for rabbits to crawl in. My God! When you cannot get shirts for the boys in the Army, what do you want to spend money to build trails and roads for? How can you justify it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not charge that to the Department of the Interior, does he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. That is just a sample of the waste. It seems to me we should draw the line some place when we do not have shirts for the boys who are doing the fighting, and when the battle of the Atlantic, as Churchill said, is going against us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not true that the committee has already re-

duced the item from \$4,000,000 several years ago to \$1,000,000 in this bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care if there is not one red cent left in it. I would rather that our soldier boys had shirts than to build roads and trails some place in the wilderness, or any other place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman not know that the Congress has appropriated enough money for the Army to buy 10 years' supply of shirts and other clothing? If sufficient shirts have not been bought, it is not the fault of this Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not want to say it is the fault of the executive department or the gentleman would send that committee that is after the snipers, as he calls them, after me. I am glad when the gentleman, a Democrat, calls attention to the fact. You may have money enough for 10 years' supply of shirts, but the administration cannot or will not give the boys the four they need.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not know who is at fault, but I do know that sufficient funds have heretofore been allowed by our committee for clothing and materials to supply a mighty big army for a mighty long time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 47, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Winnebago, Nebr.: Improvements to utilities, \$15,000;

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, and to proceed out of order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I refer this to the majority side. I thought they wanted to get through with the bill today.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thought I had an agreement with the gentleman or I would not have asked for this time.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman had an agreement, then, so far as I am concerned, he may go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes, to proceed out of order.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, 1 year ago this month House Resolution 125 created a select committee to investigate air accidents. For 12 months this committee has been making an intensive study of the causes and contributing causes of air accidents to commercial aircraft. We have interviewed experts in every branch of aviation; we have, therefore, necessarily become familiar with the most im-

portant factors involved in the successful operation of all aircraft.

When my committee was appointed the Congress was aroused because of the death of Congressman Byron in an air crash in Atlanta. I think you again have every reason to be concerned. Since December 7, 1941, when Japan made its cowardly attack at Pearl Harbor, we have witnessed a tremendous increase in military aviation in the United States. This Congress has been called upon to appropriate billions of dollars toward the war effort. We have all voted without hesitation to increase the armed forces of the United States and particularly the aviation branch of the Army and Navy to an extent which no one of us could have dreamed possible 2 or 3 years ago. We have poured out the money of our citizens and will continue to pour out their money until Japan has been vanquished. I am sure that I bespeak the conviction of every Member of the House when I say that the Congress of the United States will see to it that the armed forces of America are provided with the financial sinews of war to defeat Hitler and the Mikado's horde of yellow rats who threaten the civilization of the world.

But, ladies and gentlemen, during the past year the members of my committee—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]—have learned something about aviation. We have not dilly-dallied with this question of safety. We have made an intensive study of the causes of air accidents. We know something about the subject, and it makes our blood run cold when every day over the radio or in the public press we learn of the wastage in life and property which is occurring in our armed forces before the boys have a chance to meet the enemy. We expect to lose planes in battle. We expect to lose some of our aviators in fighting the enemy, but it makes me sick when I see our boys killed and our aircraft destroyed through the utter foolishness and incompetence of unskilled Army personnel who apparently have but little appreciation for meteorology and who send men and machines, and who order pilots to fly machines in weather which civilian pilots with thousands of hours of flying experience would not think of attempting to negotiate. Just the other day the president of one of the air lines told our committee that recently, in one of the cities served by his air line, his company had four or five ships grounded because they were advised by their meteorologists that it was unsafe to fly due to icing conditions.

While these ships were grounded in that city an Army bomber flew over its airport bound for the east, and in a few minutes five members of the crew were forced to jump in their parachutes and a \$100,000 bomber was completely destroyed. This is one of the few instances in which the crew lived to tell the story. In the last few days I know of a commercial airliner which left the city of Washington and went to Pittsburgh, where the air-line officers grounded it. A

short time after that in the same vicinity five airplanes were sent into the air by the Army to face weather conditions which the air lines with their more experienced personnel would not attempt to navigate, and four of these pilots were needlessly killed and their planes destroyed. Recently it has been estimated by an expert in air accidents that better than \$2,000,000 in military airplanes have been cracked up on the west coast alone. It is reported to me that there are 15 accidents a day to military aircraft on the west coast.

From my experience, and knowledge of air accidents, I say to you that the military leaders owe a duty to the people of the United States to protect our military airplanes until they have reached the battlefield, and that they owe a greater duty to the boys of our country who have volunteered as aviators to see that they have a chance to give their lives in battle rather than to be destroyed on a bleak mountainside.

Another thing that burns me up is the fact that we have an existing agency, to wit: the Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is manned by experts who have devoted years to the study of the causes of air accidents and who are qualified to investigate and to determine the real causes of air accidents, and yet these men are not being utilized by the military authorities to assist them in investigating and eliminating the causes of the many tragedies which are occurring in our armed forces. If I were a father, and had a son in the aviation service, and he should be killed in combat fighting against the Japanese or Germans, I would take that loss with pride and some degree of satisfaction. But, if I had a son who had had only 300 to 500 hours of aviation experience and he was ordered to fly a bomber on a peacetime mission in weather which was so bad that the pilots of the air lines, having an average of 10,000 hours of flight experience, were either grounded or refused to fly; then I should want to know who the officer was that ordered my son to fly in such weather. I would also want to know why such an officer should be permitted to destroy the property of the Government and the life of my son before either of them were permitted to serve our country's cause.

On Sunday, March 15, my committee had before it representatives of 16 of the 18 air lines in the United States. This hearing started at 10:30 in the morning and ran until 5:45 p. m. Its purpose was to discuss with the air lines how they, as organizations, could best serve the military requirements. As a result of this hearing, my committee will tomorrow lay before the proper governmental agencies a plan charted, and in complete detail, containing an offer by the air lines and a suggestion by the committee, wherein the air lines propose to furnish their facilities for the advanced training of pilots, mechanics, radio operators, meteorologists, and other services to be rendered by them for the military, and all upon a no-profit basis. This is being done with a twofold purpose: First, so that they may continue to perform their basic function of providing transportation by

air of both passengers and cargo; and second, to enable the Government to obtain from them the maximum amount of service for the war effort. There is one more thing which my committee would like to suggest to the military authorities: Study and experience of the past year have convinced us that the navigation of the air is a science which requires the united wisdom of many experts in different fields of human knowledge. No matter how skilled a pilot may be, it is nothing less than manslaughter for any person to order a pilot to undertake a routine flight in weather which skillful meteorological forecasters have predetermined as unsafe for flight.

Ladies and gentlemen, I propose that the War Department use the personnel of the Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and have these experts inquire into the causes of these accidents, and if possible, find ways to eliminate them.

As I have said before, there are many capacities in which civilians can serve their country. There are thousands of men with special talents who stand ready, willing, and able to assist in the utter destruction of the Axis Powers. So, ladies and gentlemen, my committee asks your cooperation in assisting us to see that the armed forces utilize those agencies of our Government, those men of special training—such as the Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board—to save the property which your appropriations have made possible, and the lives of our finest young men who are the potential heroes of our Republic.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriations available for expenditure for the benefit of the natives of Alaska may be used for the payment of traveling expenses of new appointees from Seattle, Wash., and from any point within Alaska, to their posts of duty in Alaska, and of traveling expenses, packing, crating, and transportation (including drayage) or personal effects of employees upon permanent change of station within Alaska, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the outstanding newspapermen here in Washington is the author of a book that I believe should have the careful reading of every Member of the Congress. It should be read by every American. Mr. Carlyle Bergeron has written "Confusion on the Potomac." I think he should add a new chapter to this splendid work. I would suggest that the new chapter be titled "Confusion in the Interior Department."

I hold in my hand the Official Bulletin of the United States Travel Bureau, Department of the Interior. The cover page carries the picture of the distinguished Secretary of the Interior. That in itself gives it an air of officialdom that cannot be ignored. Secretary Ickes urges civilian travel for relaxation to aid health and morale. This booklet is dedicated to the Secretary's insistence that America must travel if it is to be fit. I would like the distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to clear up for me a disturbing problem. How do you reconcile

this outburst of enthusiasm on the part of the Secretary of the Interior for a traveling America with his scare headlines on tires and gasoline? There seems to be some confusion. I understand that gasoline is now being rationed under order of the Secretary. I understand that all of the gas stations are closed certain hours of the day and on Sundays. And yet the Secretary in this pamphlet tells America to travel. As folks start to travel will they be able to get home? In one breath the Secretary calls for a traveling America and in the next breath he takes away the means to travel. Again I say, there is some confusion.

I see on the inside of this delightful brochure—and, remember, this is paid for by the taxpayers—the heading, "Nomads given the green light." That means that the gypsies, the rovers, the wanderers are given the go sign, the right-of-way in these days of difficulty, peril, and danger. That means that, despite the acute shortages in rubber, shortages that require rationing, and shortages in gasoline, the Secretary suggests roving for relaxation, wandering for morale. Again I say, there is some confusion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is there a date to that?

Mr. DITTER. I was hoping the gentleman would ask me that question. That is exactly why I brought this copy with me to the floor. The pamphlet speaks for itself as to date of issuance. It reached my desk on the 5th day of March 1942, and it is headed "January-February 1942." That means it is current. In other words, it is not a bit of antiquity that I have gone back into the files and pulled out. It is the latest word from the Department that I have found on morale building. It certainly appears to be up to date on its face. It is what the Secretary is presently advising, if we are to take any stock in what his publicity experts say. There may be another edition in preparation or on the press; in the minds of the propaganda specialists but, to the best of my knowledge, it has not been distributed up to this time. It may be that more confusion is coming.

I am concerned about the folks who follow the Secretary's suggestion to travel, how the nomads who are to be given the green light, how the gypsies from here, there, and elsewhere, under the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior, are to get gasoline and tires. One effusion from the Interior Department pushes America out on the highways and byways to relax, while the next outburst pulls us up peremptorily to a halt, where we are to be restricted rather than relaxed. The green light and the red light are flashed simultaneously. In one and the same breath we are told to march and told to halt. Again I say, there is some confusion.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it possible that the learned Secretary was thinking of the 500 gallons of gas in that tank that he is supposed to have had in storage when the gasoline shortage was on?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, my regard for the Secretary of the Interior would not permit me to attribute to him any motives that were purely personal or selfish. Of course, I have no information as to what he may have at hand to minimize the confusion which he is creating.

The thing that concerns me is the confusion which is caused by this pathetic conflict—these go and stop commands.

Our people are worried over the threat made by Mr. Henderson that private tires are to be seized. He has said rubber requirements will not allow "a single pound of crude rubber for new tires or for recapping" of any of the 30,000,000 passenger cars in the United States. He urges a reduction in recreational driving. The situation is acute. It is a serious condition. Mr. Henderson, at least, considers it so. If our people are to have their tires seized from them, will they be seized while they are doing the nomad act around the country, or will the seizure be made when the automobile is in the garage? Shall we follow the suggestion of Mr. Ickes or heed the commands of Mr. Henderson? Confusion worse confounded.

What are we to believe? Are we to follow Mr. Ickes and travel or are we to heed Mr. Henderson and stay at home? Are we to conserve rubber and gasoline under Mr. Henderson's restrictions or are we to use rubber and gasoline under Mr. Ickes' relaxation? "To be or not to be, that is the question."

Mr. Henderson says a 25-percent cut in the civilian use of rubber for the United Nations has been put into immediate effect, and suggests the advisability of another 25-percent reduction. That is the Price Administrator's program. But Mr. Ickes counters with the urge, according to this current Department magazine, that relaxation and morale require us to indulge in travel, to become nomads, rovers, wanderers. "Consistency thou art a jewel."

It is high time that the Secretary of the Interior and the other bureaucratic chieftains bring a little order out of chaos, a bit of conformity in orders and regulations. Carlisle Barger, despite his entertaining style and informative ability, should not have the opportunity to add another chapter to "Confusion on the Potomac." We have had entirely too much confusion. It is time that we have some consistency and common sense in the executive branch of the Government. The confusion on the Potomac is not in Congress; it is in the bureaucracies that flourish here.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I would like to present the gentleman with a piece of rubber that has been made from rabbitbrush. I wish to ask the gentleman if that will do something to solve the problem.

Mr. DITTER. I know anything that the distinguished gentleman from Nevada presents me with has intrinsic value. I would prefer to have his opinion on its value as rubber rather than to venture an opinion of my own. I am not at all informed as to what rabbitbrush may mean in the manufacture of rubber. But one thing is crystal clear to me, and that is no matter how much rabbitbrush there may be at hand or how much rubber it will make, something more is needed to bring order out of chaos, to bring consistency out of inconsistency, to clear up the confusion on the Potomac. What we need and sorely need is a very generous supply of common sense, clear thinking, and genuine cooperation on the part of the bureaucrats here in Washington.

The Clerk read as follows:

General investigations: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extensions of existing projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, including Colorado River Basin investigations, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or, if deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, National Resources Planning Board, and the Federal Power Commission, \$250,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 73, line 15, after the second comma strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$150,000."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that we appropriated \$1,700,000 last year for investigations of reclamation projects in the Colorado fund, in the reclamation general fund, and in the reclamation fund itself. The results of the investigations to date may be found on page 325 of the hearings. On that page you will see completed and ready for construction projects in the total sum of \$454,197,784. If it is our view that we need to have a backlog for postwar work, it seems to me that this presents enough of a backlog for that type of work.

We are in a struggle to win a war. We need to preserve all the manpower, all the technical engineers, all the help we can to assist the War Department and the Navy Department to win that war. Let us release some of these employees.

This amendment does not cut out all of the investigations. It is a moderate cut. It still permits them to go further and investigate the most necessary things for irrigation and for power for national defense. They still can do the most necessary things.

I have not asked to cut out the whole amount, although I believe that \$454,197,000 worth of projects is enough to keep us busy after the war. I sincerely hope the members of this Committee will not be divided along partisan lines and can look at it from the standpoint of doing the most good for our country, and stand up in unison to release the personnel this amendment will release for the national defense effort. Why can we not cut \$100,000 from this investigation under the reclamation fund and preserve it for guns and planes and tanks for MacArthur?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I trust that a substantial majority of the membership will support this amendment. I realize, as other Members do, that the expenditure of this money has value. I do think some of it is expended extravagantly, but I say again I think we must measure this thing in the light of the situation as we find it today.

Someone in defending this expenditure of \$250,000 will suggest, of course, that this money will be returned because of rents that are received from Government land. But we will still get the rent even if we do not spend any of this particular item, as I see it. Just because there is some revenue from the use of this land is not an excuse for spending more money than you would otherwise. If such were the case, you would want to increase rather than decrease it. Such is not the case.

I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. I think this item ought to be cut deeper, but we ought to cut at least this much of it. The legislation says it is for making investigations, surveys, and studies. Reduce the item by \$100,000 and you will still have \$150,000 for that purpose.

On yesterday we tried to reduce an item of \$600,000, and it was suggested then that all that money was needed for surveying and for investigation purposes, and that it was connected, of course, with our war effort. Now you have that \$600,000 you said in your discussion was needed for surveying and making investigations. We go over to another portion of the bill and find an item of \$250,000. A little later on there is another one for \$500,000 for further investigations. I just wonder how much money is really needed for investigations.

This is just a moderate cut. I sincerely believe that this is one place where you can try to help save just a little share of these huge expenditures that are being made this afternoon. I hope the membership will use a little independent judgment this afternoon. Of course, we should listen to those who are spending this money, but that is not the entire

reason why we should follow them every time. We have got to weigh this expenditure in the light of absolute need. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the individuals who may be employed by the use of this money could well be rendering their services in far more important places in the war effort.

This money is needed for the prosecution of the war, and part of the surveying and investigating could wait until this cruel war is brought to a close. It should be observed that this money is for proposed projects. Part of them can wait, especially in view of several hundred thousand dollars included in this bill, in addition to this item of \$250,000.

But right now our country is in peril. In the light of that situation, this is one chance to save just a little money, only \$100,000, which is not very much compared to the total amount of money being expended in this bill, but it will help a little, and it will at least show a turn in the minds of the Members of the House. It will indicate a definite determination to practice a little economy without injury to anyone. Do not forget this is not really a war measure. The people throughout the Nation are asking us right here and now to economize wherever we possibly can, and cut to the core. Let us join together for once, both sides of the aisle, and cut out this \$100,000. I am so sure we ought to do it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who has spent so much time and energy on this legislation.

Mr. JONES. It is not so much a question of whether we will get the money back—even a banker sometimes refuses to make loans, and in this case we are acting somewhat as a banker for these people who use the reclamation fund—it is a question of releasing the manpower to do the necessary things to win victory sooner.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and contribution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. May I ask the gentleman if any money is involved here at all? This money comes out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There it goes. That is the same old story. Just because there is some revenue in the way of rentals and income from the land owned by the Government, it is deemed proper to be a little more free with its expenditure. That is the difficulty of it. Certainly if we can get money out of the reclamation fund and save it, we should do it. Let us save this manpower and effort, and also save \$100,000. As I said awhile ago, if spending more money on this item increases the income, the committee would not have cut it at all in the first instance.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is already cut down.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand; but why did you reduce it then? Why did you not make the item \$350,000 instead of \$250,000, if your reasoning is cor-

rect? I just do not believe you can show that the expenditure of this particular money will increase the revenues in the Federal Treasury, especially with all the other money you will have appropriated to use for this purpose. Let us save another \$100,000 while we are at it.

I realize that Members who have reclamation projects in their districts have a deep interest in this matter and do not want to cut the items. They would like to keep the men on the job and have the surveys continued. I do not blame them for it. But I am talking to you about the situation as we find it this afternoon. In the light of that critical condition, I say that this is a chance to save \$100,000 needed so badly for planes and guns and other war necessities. Let us get busy and strike out this \$100,000 and save just that much money. If you have the courage of your convictions and nerve to do it, I feel you will support the amendment. I just do not believe your reasons against it are good, under the circumstances as they are this afternoon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, hope that there will be no division down the aisle on this item. Let me give you the facts concerning it. The Budget approved an estimate of \$500,000. The committee cut that half in two, reducing it to \$250,000, and I believe even the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. RICH] thought that we had made an ample cut there. This money goes not only for general investigation, but the seven southwestern States entered into a solemn compact concerning the division of the waters of the Colorado River. A goodly amount of it must be used for this work. This involves an enormous amount of surveys and also investigational work that must be carried on.

The money, as has been pointed out, is not money coming out of the Federal Treasury never to return, because it comes from the reclamation fund, and is paid back into that fund from construction charges. My young friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] simply does not have a conception of what reclamation means, not to the West alone but to America as a whole. Our population increase has been 14 percent out there in the last 10 years, against something like a 7-percent increase in the Nation as a whole.

More than 1,000,000 soldiers are out there now. The West is going to be the place from which our armies must move. They must be fed, they must be clothed, and this must be done by food and fiber raised upon lands that are watered by the hand of man. This \$250,000 leaves merely a skeleton organization to carry on a work that is the life of the western half of the United States. This amendment represents the worst sort of mistake and the most foolish type of economy that could be conceived. Some reference is made to the number of planes this so-called savings here would build. There is no shortage of battle-ships and planes, because we irrigate

lands in the West or because we produce crops on those lands or because we try to feed the Nation in part.

We are now in the western half of this country scarcely meeting 60 percent of our agricultural needs because of the limitation on the use of water. In the billion acres of land comprising the West we have only another 20,000,000 acres that can ever be brought into productivity by water. Yet you say you are going to cut this item so that the Reclamation Bureau can render no service or even care for the projects we have there.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 27, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, \$99,975.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I note with deep disappointment that the \$5,000,000 item, so essential to the prompt completion of the transmission lines and steam stand-by plant for the Central Valley project have been omitted from this bill, although it was included in the Budget.

It seems strange to me that the California members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department should have permitted this appropriation to be cut out, particularly since the power to be derived from this project is so essential to the great shipbuilding and other essential war industries in the State.

The Central Valley project is an important power factor for the winning of this war. This House should not permit that appropriation to be eliminated. What is it going to profit the Nation if, in order to please the private power interests of California we lose the use of this power in this critical time?

True, if we fail to supply these facilities, the private power interests may, to their own private profit, force the Government to sell them the electric energy generated at these plants at a ruinously low price, a price which will not and cannot produce sufficient revenue to enable the Treasury to collect a sufficient amount to reimburse the Government for its outlay.

The two items which are eliminated from the appropriation on line 10 of page 78 of the bill—the steam plant and transmission lines—will make or break the financial success of the project. Without them the project's future is anyone's guess.

Conflicting evidence was presented to the committee—

Says page 12 of the committee report—as to the necessity for the construction of a steam plant at Antioch, Calif., for which \$5,000,000 was requested under an estimated total cost of \$20,000,000.

That diffident little sentence is the committee's only explanation for its action. The real reason for the constant opposition to the project is to be found

in the attitude of some selfish interests, concerned only with profit to themselves.

Now what was this conflicting evidence?

The committee says:

Evidence given by one witness was to the effect that an existing power agency in that area would be willing to purchase the entire supply of power generated at Shasta Dam at a fair profit to the Government, thus obviating the necessity of the Government constructing transmission lines or installing a steam plant.

This statement implies that the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation, the power monopoly of central California, would buy Shasta power and allow the Government, the people, us, a fair profit.

Would you call the \$60,000,000 difference the steam plant will make to the project's revenue a fair profit? What of the profit to the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation on the transmission of power for irrigation pumping which the irrigation will have to pay if the Government turns Central Valley power over to this company.

I could speak all afternoon on the fight this very company put up against construction of the Central Valley project in the first place; on its assertions 10 years ago that it had idle plants, that no additional power was needed in the area. In its opposition to any power development but its own it would have deprived the Sacramento Valley of flood control; the San Francisco Bay area of water for irrigation and industry, and the farmers of San Joaquin Valley of sorely needed relief from heavy pumping costs and lowering water tables. The Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation's only concern has been and always will be its own pocket. That company has outdone itself today.

The committee failed to give due consideration to the facts, the clearest evidence offered by the Government.

First, supporting this \$5,000,000 item was the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted by the President of the United States.

Second, came the Commissioner of Reclamation who said:

It would be of substantial advantage to install the steam plant at Antioch.

Why did the President or Commissioner Page recommend these items? As I read Mr. Page's testimony on pages 450-451, he showed that the steam plant would be a financial advantage not only to the Government but to the water users and other beneficiaries of the Central Valley project. He showed that operation of the steam plant by the Bureau would yield net revenues of \$549,000 annually in excess of the offer of the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation. In 40 years, \$61,960,000 could be applied to the construction costs of the project and unless this income was received, this huge amount would be borne by the taxpayers of the United States or by the water users of the San Joaquin Valley and Contra Costa area or other beneficiaries.

The third voice in favor of the steam plant was the War Production Board. It advised the committee that the Antioch steam plant was an essential part of the

ultimate development of the Central Valley project. The War Production Board was unable to say "at this time when priorities could be made available for steam-station equipment to proceed with construction." Obviously the War Production Board could not commit itself on priorities in advance of an appropriation by the Congress for a steam plant or an application by the Bureau of Reclamation for the necessary rating. The War Production Board, or its predecessor, the O. P. M., gave Shasta Dam power plant a rating of A-1-E to assure equipment because of the need for power in northern California. That need for power today is even more urgent. It is unthinkable that an adequate rating for a steam plant would not be forthcoming.

And on top of this impartial evidence, in itself emphatic enough to make me marvel at the failure of the Appropriations Committee subcommittee to recommend the \$5,000,000 needed, is the statement of the Federal Power Commission. It warns of the imminent shortage of power in northern California. On page 935 of the hearings Chairman Olds says of the proposed steam plant:

I think it is wise for the Government to build the steam plant.

On page 929 Director Tate, of the National Defense Power Division, also warns of critical power shortages in the Central Valley region. Despite the increases in capacity by Shasta and Keswick Dams, the shortages will be:

	Kilowatts
1943-----	285,000
1944-----	105,000
1945-----	215,000
1946-----	245,000

The Central Valley project was conceived and authorized as a means of improving navigation, providing flood protection, supplying supplemental irrigation water for hard-pressed farmers, municipal and industrial supplies, and "for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes." The Congress has appropriated \$110,950,000 toward the construction of the project, estimated to cost \$264,990,000.

The steam plant is essential to the economic operation of the project. Because of the fluctuating flow of the Sacramento River, stand-by facilities are necessary to make the output available at all times and more valuable. Transmission lines are required to carry the power to the Delta region for irrigation pumping as well as to load centers in the San Francisco Bay region. These transmission lines will have to be built to market this power. There is not sufficient transmission capacity now to carry the Shasta power. The only question is whether they should be built by and for the Pacific Gas & Electric, or by and for the people and their Government, who own the project.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation item is vitally necessary for the continuation of work on the Coachella branch of the All-American Canal in order to assure

the continued existence of Coachella Valley and to protect the millions which the United States has already invested in this canal and also to protect American water right in the Colorado River, which will be lost, so far as California is concerned, to Mexico or some other State unless they are put to beneficial use in the Coachella Valley.

This project is directly connected with vital war activities in that the 20,000 acres now under cultivation if assured a continuing supply of water will produce between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 of food products needed in the southern California defense industry areas. The project when completed will release 20,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity now being consumed annually in pumping 1,200 wells. In addition the canal will produce, at two power drops, 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. This 70,000,000 kilowatt-hours saved and produced is needed in the war industries of Los Angeles and San Diego areas. In addition the project will furnish 80,000 acres of land admirably suited in soil and climate to the growing of guayule, the rubber plant vitally necessary to supplying the natural crude rubber now cut off from the East Indies.

All of the foregoing finds ample support in the testimony of Commissioner Page, of the Reclamation Service, pages 388 to 392, Mr. Lee Anderson, Director of the Coachella Valley County Water District, pages 1026 to 1031; and Phil D. Swing, a former Member of the House, pages 1031 to 1037, before the House Appropriations Committee.

The early completion of this Canal has recently been urged by the California State Legislature, the Colorado River Board of California, and numerous other official and civic bodies.

(Mr. THOMAS F. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply taking this time for the explicit purpose of calling the gentleman's attention to page 110 of the hearing, a statement which is signed by Donald Nelson, who is in charge of the construction of all plants in the United States at this particular moment. I will ask the gentleman to read that statement, if he will, and reach his own conclusions as to why that particular provision was stricken from the bill.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 78, line 14, after the comma, following the name "Oklahoma", strike out "\$99,975" and insert "\$600,000".

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not offered for the purpose of spending the public funds but for the purpose of protecting the funds that you and I have invested in this project. This is the only irrigation and reclamation project in the State of Oklahoma. It is in my district. I know every

foot of the ground, and in this connection I desire to quote from two letters just received day before yesterday and yesterday from the Department of the Interior and the United States Department of Agriculture.

I will now read these two letters:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, March 24, 1942.

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: In response to your telephone call regarding the progress of construction of the Lugert-Altus Project in Oklahoma, you are advised that the appropriation of \$99,975, contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1943, will provide for a very restricted program. Unless a larger amount is made available it will be necessary to reduce considerably the number of employees.

At the present time there are no war activities or industries in the immediate locality which would interfere with the labor supply. Construction is being performed by Government forces, and local labor is used.

The problem of obtaining priorities for critical materials would not be serious because the construction of the dam and canals will require only a small amount of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The purposes of the project are irrigation, domestic water supply, and flood control. Irrigation water will be supplied to 20,000 acres of land unsuccessfully dry farmed, and a partial water supply will be provided for 50,000 acres additional. In all, 500 to 700 farms will be benefited. The city of Altus will obtain a supplemental domestic water supply, and has contracted to repay a part of the project costs.

At present the project lands are sparsely settled and dry farmed. The soil is rich, and if an acute food shortage should develop, the land could be brought into use rapidly. I anticipate the project will be devoted almost wholly to dairying and livestock feeding.

Construction at the present rate of progress would require an appropriation of \$600,000 in addition to the \$180,000 for flood control to be furnished by the War Department.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. PAGE, Commissioner.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1942.

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR VICTOR: I have been informed that there is some talk of not having sufficient funds to complete the Lugart Irrigation project at this time. As you know, I still own and operate the farm west of Altus, where I was born and reared, and I am familiar with the entire farming area in Jackson and adjoining counties. While my farm is not located in the area to be serviced by the water from this project, I am interested in seeing this completed because there is a need for more diversified farming in the area than is practical to carry out without being assured of an adequate water supply during dry periods.

As you know, this project has been approved by a vote of the farmers and is to be self-liquidated by increased taxes. It would be very unjust to the farmers in the area to be serviced by this project if completion is delayed or suspended. A considerable amount of money has already been spent on the dirt fills which would be washed away by floodwaters if further construction is suspended.

Most of the machinery and equipment is now on the ground, and there will be very little additional machinery or strategic material required, since this project is mainly of earthen construction, using very little concrete or steel.

There are 70,000 acres of very fertile land which requires no fertilizer and would be devoted largely to the production of food and feed crops. This land is well adapted to the production of fruit, vegetables, dairy products, and livestock which is needed in the food-for-freedom program. It would be very unjust for the farmers to pay the increased taxes for the amount of money already spent on this dam and then be deprived of the additional income from the crops which are needed in our war efforts.

On behalf of the farmers which will be served by this project, I urge you and the committee to do everything possible to secure the appropriation of \$800,000 necessary to further this work.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. WALKER,
Assistant Director, Southern Division.

I did not ask for \$800,000. I have asked for \$600,000, which is a fair request. It will protect the funds already spent by the farmers, and also the funds that have been loaned to them by the Government, and also the \$180,000 which the War Department is going to expend. If this is not constructed, it is like constructing a railway bridge half way across a stream, and then letting the engine run on that and run off into the creek.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman tell us where we are going to get the money?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The money is coming from my farmers.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean that the gentleman's farmers would loan that money to the Government to do this work before we start it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; but my farmers are buying defense bonds, and they are willing to pay this money back. I urge that the amendment be supported.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, this project, like many others, has much to recommend it, but it would be impossible for us to support this amendment at this time. I submit the proffered amendment to the House for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It is not my purpose to offer an amendment. If I were to offer an amendment at this time—the point has already been passed in the reading of the bill—it would be on page 78, line 5. There I notice an appropriation for the Gila project, \$250,000. That is about one-fourth of what we have been appropriating for that project. I understand that the committee has cut every part of this bill to the bone, taking all facts into consideration, and I understand perfectly well their logic in so doing.

However, I feel I would be remiss in my duty as a Representative from the State of Arizona if I did not call attention

to some very important facts in connection with this Gila project. Let us look at this proposition for a moment, and I leave it to your serious calculation. We have now spent about \$9,000,000 on this project.

It involves the Imperial Diversion Dam on the Colorado River and the Gila Canal, which is about 21 miles in length, and which brings the water from the Colorado under the Gila River through a syphon to the very edge of the desert which we intend to irrigate. At the former rate of progress, we, of course, will be several years in completing this great irrigation project, whereas even in peacetimes we should have speeded up the work, so as to minimize the loss of water rights to Mexico. The coming of the war situation has put another face on the matter. For war purposes, it could be made highly and vitally profitable almost immediately, though not as originally intended. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] said a moment ago that a certain proposition would be like building a bridge halfway across a river and not putting in the final span. We find ourselves now somewhat in this predicament regarding the Gila project. We have spent \$9,000,000 in the past 7 years and today are at a point where an extra million dollars would enable the water to be placed on 70,000 acres upon this mesa, because the power plant is about finished, the necessary pumping plant is finished, the equipment already to install, and they are now putting in the distribution system upon the level desert mesa.

Someone may ask what would be the advantage if that could be done within a few months. Mr. Chairman, that land could produce vast quantities of food. Seventy thousand acres could be put under irrigation within a year's time. In a section where alfalfa grows 365 days in the year and where six cuttings are had annually, think what 70,000 acres could produce of food for our Army and Navy so near San Diego, Los Angeles, and other Pacific coast points.

But, perhaps, better still, there is in southern Arizona, the soil and climate and all the physical set-up suitable for the growing of the guayule plant for rubber production. Here is the most splendid opportunity of any place I know of for the war effort to be furthered, through the production of home-grown rubber. It would require but a small extra expenditure just at this point in its development.

I am not offering an amendment, but I do want to impress upon the House today that here is a small expenditure that would yield mightily in a short time in our war effort toward the winning of the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

General investigations: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extensions of existing

projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, including Colorado River Basin investigations, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or, if deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, National Resources Planning Board, and the Federal Power Commission, \$500,000;

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 79, line 7, strike out line 7 and the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 18.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment on the desk proposes to strike out all funds for general investigations. I have another amendment to the second paragraph on that page to strike out the administrative expenses also. This would provide a saving of \$950,000, but that \$950,000 is quite infinitesimal compared to the potentialities of this paragraph.

You will note by a close reading of the language on page 79 that this money is for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal projects, those that are still in the future, and for extensions of existing projects and studies of water conservation and development plans, either independently or in conjunction with any other agency. It is a considerable chore to dig out all of these totals, but let me summarize this whole business for you.

At the present time there is authorized or under construction projects that total about \$1,355,000,000. That includes \$148,000,000 for Boulder Dam, \$65,000,000 for the All-American Canal, \$55,000,000 for the Big Thompson, \$24,000,000 for the Palisades Dam, \$23,000,000 for the Marshall Ford, \$55,000,000 for the Valley Gravity Canal, \$435,000,000 for Grand Coulee, and a number of smaller projects.

In the report to the subcommittee, as evidenced in the hearings, in addition to the \$1,355,000,000 authorized or under construction, they have completed engineering surveys and data on still another 29 projects, including 8 steam plants and 8 hydroelectric plants that will cost \$281,000,000, and the day that they throw the first shovel of earth on those various projects this Congress is committed to another \$281,000,000.

But that is not the whole story. This particular language and the appropriation of \$950,000 will be the beginning of new proposed Federal projects in the future. They have 285 projects at which they are going to look and on which they are making preliminary reconnaissance surveys. There are 9 in Arkansas, 5 in California, 13 in Colorado, 10 in Idaho, 6 in Kansas, and 11 in Texas, and so on.

When they first came before the Budget Bureau they asked for 388 persons for this particular activity, although that will be cut down somewhat because the committee reduced the funds. But the point is that if you leave this engineering and survey money in the bill, they will start in to find likely projects out of the 285 potential possibilities, and when they

get through the \$1,355,000,000 already authorized or under construction will be like so much chicken feed.

There is only one way to stop it, and that is to stop it now. They say that tall oaks from little acorns grow. I might paraphrase that and say that tall aches from little toe corns grow. This little toe corn from which the ache will grow will cost billions unless we stop these reconnaissance and survey items at this time when the Nation is at war.

I want to get this to the committee: The subcommittee struck out the steam plant and two transmission lines for the Central Valley, amounting to some \$13,000,000. When the Central Valley was first presented to Congress by the California engineers they estimated the cost at \$170,000,000. The Bureau of Reclamation revised that cost up to \$234,000,000. They testified before JEN JOHNSON's subcommittee that the estimate now is \$264,000,000. So they missed it by \$94,000,000, or more than 55 percent. Some of the boys who are interested in the St. Lawrence waterway had better take that figure to heart, because if the engineers cannot do a better job getting close to an estimate, the \$264,000,000 preliminary estimate will probably run up to five or six hundred million on the basis of the kind of guessing that the engineers did on the Central Valley in the first instance.

But here is \$950,000 for investigations and surveys of proposed Federal projects. They state to the subcommittee that they number some 285. If you want to commit this Congress to an expenditure that will fairly imperil the Treasury, all you have to do is to let this money stay in the bill and the reclamation engineers will do the rest.

I commend to your good judgment this amendment and to strike out that authority and the money for these surveys in the future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement as to time on this paragraph. Would 30 minutes be sufficient?

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like 5 minutes myself.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The following gentlemen have indicated a desire to be recognized: Messrs. JOHNS, HINSHAW, CASE of South Dakota, WHITE, MURDOCK, JONES, CURTIS, and LEAVY, eight Members. Each will be recognized for 4 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Washington.

Does the gentleman from Idaho desire recognition?

Mr. WHITE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, for a gentleman who comes from the great State of Illinois, the gentleman who just addressed us did pretty well. My only regret is that he did not explain what he meant by "these projects."

What we need at this time, Mr. Chairman, is food. We need production from the existing irrigation districts. It is generally recognized that there is a shortage of water on these large irrigation districts of the West that are all equipped. The railroads are there, the facilities are there, the farms are there, the people are on the land, but the water fails along in the middle of the summer and production is curtailed. The only way this need can be supplied is for the Bureau of Reclamation, with its engineering force to go into the field and make investigation of the available water supply and plan new projects that will produce the supplemental water. This has been our trouble in the irrigation districts of the West, and particularly in the State of Idaho. The engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation, through their investigations, have found that there is available water that can be utilized by establishing supplemental projects—and do not forget that word "supplemental."

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Cannot this all be postponed until after the war?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, if we can postpone supplying our Army and Navy with food, sure, we can postpone it; but our job today is to supply the military forces of the United States with food from these irrigation districts; and, Mr. Chairman, do not forget that the theater of our military activities is going to be largely on the Pacific coast, and the source of supply of the Pacific coast is largely confined to these rich, fertile but semi-arid valleys where we must put water on the land; and the only means by which we can do so is to ferret out the supply of water in the several districts and to devise, engineer, and put in operation plans that will supply this supplemental water. These are not new projects, if you please. This does not have to be confined strictly to new projects. All we want is to utilize existing facilities, the railroads, the processing plants, the creameries, the dairies the packing houses and other utilities that are on these projects, utilize them to full capacity. The only way we can do this is to put water on the land by providing supplemental projects such as we have at Anderson Ranch where by storing up water that otherwise would escape to the sea and using it in the later months they increase very greatly the productivity of the land. I cannot understand this idea that we want to hamper and hamstring the policy and plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Government in supplying the food that is so vital to win this war, supplies for our Navy, Army, and military forces.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment at the desk not to strike out

all of this fund, but just a portion. The gentleman from Illinois, however, has introduced an amendment to strike out the whole fund, and I think after you examine the bill itself you will find he is not far out of the way. I would like to have the attention now of every member of the committee who is on the floor, and there are not very many here at the present time. May I say to you that some of these seats that are temporarily vacated here now will be permanently vacated later on unless we pay more attention to these appropriation bills and what comes before the committee.

I call attention to the language on page 79:

This general investigation is to enable the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extension of existing projects.

Let us turn back. We have just appropriated \$250,000, and this is the language used on page 73, the exact language used on page 79:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extensions of existing projects and studies of water conservation and development plans, including Colorado River Basin investigations.

I call your attention to page 74, to the Colorado River development fund:

For continuation and extension of studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of waters of the Colorado River system. \$250,000.

Mr. Chairman, here is an opportunity to strike out \$950,000 without injuring anybody. There is no use of going out now and spending and investigating as to where we can spend it. We are going to have plenty to spend money for without going out and hunting some place to take the taxpayers' money at this time. Here is a place where we can save without injuring anybody because you have a fund here of \$400,000 that, as I have pointed out to you, can be used for this purpose.

You will find as you go on reading the balance of this bill that a great deal of the amount that is to be appropriated is for investigations of some kind. It is not for anything that we actually need now for war or for anything that will relieve humanity, and in all the talk that we have had here this afternoon about these appropriations, nobody has said anything about where we are going to get not only the money but the people to carry out these projects. They are going into the war and the number are going to be reduced like the appropriations here should be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the question is often raised on the left side of this aisle, "Where are you going to get the money?" That was answered a moment

ago, but I fear the answer was not heard by all.

In many cases this money comes out of a reclamation fund, which is a revolving fund set up 40 years ago by the Newlands Act of 1902. This fund is functioning in a most marvelous fashion in all the western reclamation States.

Here is a thing I want to call attention to in regard to this item. I am a little bit surprised at my friends on both sides of the aisle who are lawyers for not calling attention to it. I am not a lawyer. Time after time I hear men in this House say that we must regard the sanctity of contracts, with which I agree, and I recall, too, that there is a provision in the Constitution of the United States regarding the sanctity of contracts.

I call your attention to a thing here that seems to me to partake of the nature of a contract, in that part of the appropriation to provide engineering investigations in the Colorado River Basin.

As a member of the Reclamation Committee of this House, I recall that in the last Congress we passed a bill, which was a complicated bill, and we had considerable difficulty getting it through. It involved a readjustment of rates for power produced at Boulder Dam. Boulder Dam power is produced not by the Government but by private utilities. These private utilities were willing to sharpen their pencils and get right down and figure hard, cold mathematical facts. They agreed to certain power rates which they were willing to pay for the valuable privilege of getting power from falling water at Boulder Dam. That money was to go into the Treasury. I look upon this law as a binding contract. As a part of the consideration involved in that law, some of the money was to be spent for investigational purposes. As the money is paid into the fund some of it must be spent for that purpose along the Colorado River, and this is an agreement with the States of the Colorado River Basin, a binding contract, just as much so as a promissory note or a financial bond.

Part of that money was to be spent for investigational purposes. We did not say in the law that so much should be spent in any one particular year, but that is immaterial. I think we would break faith with the law that we passed here last Congress, I think we would break faith with the seven States of the Colorado Basin, if we did not continue this investigation as originally planned.

Of course, you may say this is not immediately needed. It is needed. I go on the assumption that it is imperatively needed, because I feel that all the marvelous work that has been done thus far is but a start of that which we ought to expect in years to come. Because we are in a war now and need food and raw materials, which are produced so abundantly on irrigated acres, is no reason why we should turn those acres back to the desert or confine to the desert those which are now in a desert condition. It is just as necessary to provide food and fiber for our war effort as to build ships, planes, and guns.

I want particularly to call the attention of my friends who are of the legal fraternity to the fact that the money

provided in the last three items for engineering investigations in the Colorado Basin has been virtually guaranteed out of private funds to the Colorado River States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, my amiable, able, and distinguished friend from Illinois, and my very good friend from Wisconsin also, probably has had the opportunity of going to the West where the arid countries are a great expanse of territory. I appreciate his desire and I go along with his desire to save the Government money, but I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the money he is discussing cutting out by his amendment is not Government money in the sense that it is appropriated from the general taxpayers. That money is being paid into a special fund in the Treasury by the water and power users and the real property taxpayers of the cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, and several other cities in the metropolitan water district and elsewhere for the use of water and power. It is being paid under the terms of a contract or compact between them and the Colorado River Basin States.

We do not take a single dime from the Federal Government for this project as a gift. We have obtained a loan, for which we have signed our bond.

We are repaying that loan to the Federal Government with interest and a profit, which in turn, by agreement, is being allocated to certain of the States for investigation and development of their own areas by the use of water. Anyone who says that this is going to cost the Federal Government money is evidently incorrect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the gentleman referring to only one project of all of the 235 that are included?

Mr. HINSHAW. I am referring to any project which comes under the Colorado River Basin compact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This does not relate to the Colorado River Basin as a particular item at all, it relates to all the surveys of proposed projects in the future.

Mr. HINSHAW. I speak particularly of the Colorado River Basin, and some of the development funds referred to here come from those sources, I know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My colleague is under a misapprehension about it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know the particulars of the other projects, but I do know that practically every reclamation project and every water-use project in the West is being paid for by the users of the water and of the power that arises therefrom. These are not gifts to us. We borrow the money, sign our bond, and repay the money with interest and sinking fund.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. One of the principal factors in the Colorado River project is the metropolitan water system.

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. That is being carried by the taxpayers of that system.

Mr. HINSHAW. By the taxpayers and the water users and power users in that area. It has nothing to do with the United States except as a lender.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The United States does not have a cent invested in it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman feel that in view of the very great need that might arise in the future for additional production of food and for the additional production of power and all these other things, it may well be that these investigations are quite as important, for example, as the investigation to determine the location of minerals might be?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is quite possible. I do not know how far in advance we should go of the time when these projects are needed, and I am not willing to state whether or not this development fund is necessary for these purposes now, because it may be that we have enough things prepared in advance for the time being; but I would not be willing to have anyone carry the inference on the floor of this House that these funds are coming from the taxpayers of the United States. They are not. They are coming from the people who use the property and use the water and use the power.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Cannot some of this food we may need be raised on the good land of the country that the Government is now paying to have lie idle?

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not in favor of allowing good, fertile lands to lie idle and meantime struggle and pay out huge sums in an attempt to successfully farm poor land that never should have been turned over. I do know that in our part of the country our fertile lands do not lie idle any more than we can help, because our population is very rapidly increasing and we need all the food we can raise. We import great quantities of corn and wheat and dairy products from the great Middle West to supplement our own production, while we export the surpluses of those foods which are peculiar to our soil and climate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is one which the friends of reclamation and those you designated as the enemies of reclamation can join in adopting. I say this because this paragraph provides for investigations of projects in the future. We have already a backlog of \$454,000,000 worth of such projects.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I cannot yield.

Mr. CURTIS. There is no backlog whatever of new projects.

Mr. JONES. The statements in the hearings speak for themselves at page 325, and the gentleman can take opportunity to refer to them. I think my statement is correct.

Now, there has been the argument made that we need to have more projects investigated in order to get more food for the country. Out in that territory you have to have a half section of land in order to graze one cow, I am informed, and besides that, the Department of Agriculture and the A. A. A. have put 50,000,000 acres of productive land out of cultivation on a scarcity of production program. In addition to that, as the chairman of our subcommittee pointed out a few days ago, when we were considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, that many people were drawing \$10,000 per farm in A. A. A. checks for not tilling the soil, on large farms in the South, and at the same time their unemployed tenants were migrating to the West. The A. A. A. has made the first American gypsies.

Now, you gentlemen from the West who are interested in reclamation claim a 14-percent increase in population as a reason for these projects, yet it is brought about by your agricultural program that is throwing those tenants out of work and putting them into Farm Security-operated communal camps. I reassert, and I ask you now to read the testimony of your own witness, Mr. Page: With all the funds that had been supplied for 1942 for reclamation projects only 50,000 acres were brought into production—50,000 acres which does not begin to compare with the fertile lands of Wisconsin, Ohio, Iowa, Illinois, or Indiana, where we can raise many bushels of grain to the acre instead of a few bushels to the acre on this semiarid land. This is the land your Agriculture Department is paying three-quarters of a billion dollars to take out of production in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa. How many millions will you have to spend for investigation, and how many billion dollars' worth of projects will you have to construct in order to duplicate the production of the land that is put out of production by the Department of Agriculture, another branch of the same administration of the Federal Government?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I think if I were recommending a very much needed law so far as Members of Congress are concerned, it would be that no Member should be permitted to serve in this House, at least not a second term, until he has traveled over the United States to a certain degree, and, certainly, he should not be permitted to serve on the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations until he has gone out into the great West and has seen what it is.

My genial and capable colleague from Ohio talked about western irrigated lands stating 100 acres are required to support a single cow. Why, we have single acres out there that last year produced \$160 worth of products. No irrigated area

that is not producing from \$30 to \$50 per acre in crop production annually in normal years can be considered a successful project.

Now, if I may use a slang expression; unfortunately, there seems to be a hang-over from the feeling that existed in the Mississippi Valley States during the period of the depression in reference to bringing a competitor into the field of farm crops, and there developed then a sort of psychology or prejudice against western reclamation. There was a fear that we would be producing crops beyond those which the Nation needed and thus depress prices. I regret that my friends have not shifted positions a little and seen the change that has come into this Nation in the last 6 months.

We were told by the Secretary of Agriculture a short time ago that this year was a critical year in the production of every type of agricultural crops except wheat, and next year is going to be worse. We imported in the last 7 or 8 years crops that now we cannot import and we must now produce.

Coming now to the items in question here, this item came into this bill the first time last year and it was \$1,000,000. It was submitted to us at \$750,000 and we cut it to \$500,000. I do not want in any way to mislead any Member of the House. Some of the Members on the left of the aisle here spoke for this and said that this comes from the reclamation revolving fund.

This is one place in the reclamation appropriation where there is a direct appropriation. This is a direct appropriation that is not repayable, but it is justified a thousandfold. It came first before us a year ago because we had the Case-Wheeler Act placing new duties upon the Bureau. We are making it possible for thousands and thousands of families along the one-hundredth meridian, and west thereof, in the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and those States, to get their projects engineered, and it likewise reaches all the rest of the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has brought out two points that I wanted to touch on. Unfortunately, I was called away to answer a long-distance telephone call, or I would have taken my time on this provision in the bill.

This represents a cut of one-half of what the appropriation last year was and \$250,000 below the estimates.

The other point is that this does not come from the Treasury, but on these water-conservation projects, under the Case-Wheeler Act, there is no money in this bill for those projects.

Mr. LEAVY. No; I did not mean to infer that, either; but some of this money goes to the engineering of those projects. Let me show you how important it is that the engineering work be done. These reclamation projects are necessarily giant projects. Some of them go to two or three hundred million dollars. They are not commenced until they are sound financially and engineeringly feasible.

The Reclamation Bureau is perhaps one of the most thorough, most efficient, and capable agencies in the United States. We made an initial appropriation 3 years ago of two and a half million dollars for a project. The Reclamation Service stated that they had not completed the engineering detail on it. The next year they reported back that they had not spent any of the money; that it is a 30-million-dollar project, and that they would not undertake it until they had done the engineering. Now, the project is under way in another section of the State on the same river. The place selected as the first site proved to be one where failure was sure to follow construction. The amendment should be voted down, and it will be if we base our votes upon reason and the best interests of our Nation and not upon sectionalism or prejudice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 26, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: Page 79, line 18, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$350,000."

The CHAIRMAN. All debate upon this paragraph is exhausted. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this question has already been settled under the previous amendment, which was to strike out the entire amount.

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment seeks to insert a different amount. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For administrative expenses on account of the above projects, including personal services (not to exceed \$200,000) and other expenses in the District of Columbia and personal services and other expenses in the field, \$450,000.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: Page 79, line 23, strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$350,000."

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNS. Yes.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the 5 minutes allotted to

me. I realize that we have considerably more to read in the bill. I have already called attention to page 73 and page 74 where we have appropriations of \$450,000 for this purpose, and if we cut down \$100,000 in these expenses, and we ought to be able to cut down some, because many of these men will be called into service, then we can spend this amount of money on essential things. Here is an opportunity to cut out \$100,000, and I hope the Democrats on my right will see to it that we do cut down this \$100,000.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, general fund, construction, \$70,317,970.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The total which has been just read on construction for the Reclamation Bureau in my judgment, if sound policy had been followed, would have been \$86,140,000, so that it might have included two items for the Central Valley project in California, without which the beneficial effect of that project to the people of our State and its financial soundness, from the standpoint of the Federal Government, will be seriously impaired. One of these items should have been \$10,723,000 for completion of a transmission line already started; the other should have been \$5,000,000 for the starting of a steam plant to firm the power and make possible efficient operation of the project. On page 999 of the hearings there is a paragraph from the report of the Federal Power Commission in which they granted to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. permission to build two new power plants on the Feather River, in which they said that in their judgment it was necessary to grant these licenses, because this additional electrical capacity is vitally necessary, but in which they also said that the earliest possible completion of the Central Valley project, including a proposed steam plant at Antioch, was absolutely necessary if a serious power shortage is to be avoided.

The committee, however, struck from the bill not only the money for the steam plant, but also the money for the transmission line to carry the power from the dam to the markets where it can be used and where much of it must be used for war industries. As a matter of fact, at this very same time, because we are denied the opportunity to begin construction of a public steam plant, the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. has to build one of their own, yet one of the arguments advanced against the public steam plant was that they could not get priorities. Where is the P. G. & E. going to get theirs?

Another reason advanced for cutting out this item is that the P. G. & E. has made an offer to buy this power at the dam. I do not have any doubt of it in the world, for the one thing that this monopoly private power company of northern and central California wants to do is to protect that monopoly. The

main reason they have opposed this Central Valley project from the beginning, and the main reason they are willing to take the entire supply of this publicly generated power is because they are afraid the Central Valley will bring electricity to the people of that area at what it is worth and will make it possible for the farmers to have their water and the power connected with it, at a reasonable cost.

The city of Sacramento at this hour is attempting to establish a municipally owned plant. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. knows that if Central Valley has its own transmission line they can supply the city of Sacramento and save the people of that community many millions of dollars. It is no wonder P. G. & E. is willing to make an offer for this power. But that offer provides that Central Valley must deliver a certain number of kilowatt hours of electricity throughout the year. This will make it entirely uncertain whether the Central Valley project can operate effectively in supplying water for irrigation, for salinity control, and adequate flow of the river. For the terms of such contract would have to be fulfilled and delivery of the stipulated amount of power to P. G. & E. would take precedence over all other features of the project.

The War Production Board said that this project was needed; that the steam plant was needed. Mr. Page, of the Reclamation Bureau, said it was needed. The only testimony against it comes from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., so far as I know.

For my part, it seems to me it is poor economy to tie up the expenditure of \$264,000,000 of the people's money in a situation where it can only find one market outlet, in a situation where there is not any transmission line to carry the power; where a private power company has to build a transmission line on its own account, and thus leave the people of California without the possibility of the benefits really coming to them, and the Federal Government in a position where it cannot economically or efficiently market this power to the direct consumers, as it should be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I think the gentleman's remarks are in accord, for the most part, with my own views, but I notice he made one statement which I think he should delete from his remarks. No matter who buys the power or where it is delivered, the water will flow down and wash out the salinity just the same.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, of course. Let me explain to the gentleman what I had in mind. I am glad the gentleman brought it to my attention. The point is that if you made a contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric for the delivery of a certain amount of electrical energy to them, and if you need, on a cer-

tain occasion, to use that water for some of the other purposes, you might be in a position where you could not do it. You might have to store water to be able to live up to your contract when the water was badly needed for irrigation, salinity control, or stream regulation. If Central Valley had its own steam plant such dangers would be completely avoided.

Mr. BUCK. But the water will generate the power at the source of the dam and then it will flow down and wash out the salinity, and you cannot overcome that, as a fact. I want to make your remarks correct. That is all. You can delete everything I have said, but correct yourself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not want to delete anything the gentleman has said.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is it not true that the State of California some years ago undertook to establish what is known as the State power and water authority?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And is it not true that the Pacific Gas & Electric, according to the State railroad commission, spent \$500,000 to defeat that measure?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. And it bears out the point I made at the beginning of my speech. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would like to say further, in answer to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK], that it is true, if you are compelled to deliver a certain amount of power you may have to hold the water back when you should let it go down to meet other needs.

The committee, in the report, advises that it has eliminated from the bill the Budget estimate of \$5,000,000 for the installation of the steam plant for the Central Valley project and \$10,723,000 for the construction of transmission lines for the project.

From the wording of the report, there appears to be a disregard of the weight of evidence in favor of these two items which are the backbone of the financial stability of the Central Valley project and of the need for additional power for war industries in northern California. The report says:

That conflicting evidence was presented to the committee as to the necessity for the construction of a steam plant at Antioch, Calif., for which \$5,000,000 was requested under an estimated total cost of \$20,000,000.

What is this conflicting evidence?

In support of its action in eliminating these vital items, the committee gives only this citation:

Evidence given by one witness was to the effect that an existing power agency in that area would be willing to purchase the entire supply of power generated at Shasta Dam at a fair profit to the Government, thus obviating the necessity of the Government constructing transmission lines or installing a steam plant.

This reference is to a general suggestion by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which monopolizes the power market in

northern California and would squelch all competition, public or private. I could speak all afternoon on the antagonistic attitude of this company to the construction of the Central Valley project; on its assertions 10 years ago that no additional power was needed in the area; that it had idle plants. In its opposition to public power development it would have deprived the Sacramento Valley of flood control; the Contra Costa of water for irrigation and industrial uses; and the irrigators of San Joaquin Valley of solely needed relief from heavy pumping costs and lowering water tables. I shall have more to say of its offer in a few minutes.

In any event this is the sole voice against the constructive proposals to assure an adequate supply of power for war industries through a steam plant.

The transmission system for which an initial appropriation has already been made will be necessary regardless of whether or not the steam plant is installed. Otherwise power from Shasta and Keswick Dams will be bottled up and subject only to the mercies of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The line is needed to carry power to the Delta region to pump water for irrigation to the San Joaquin Valley. It would be a serious matter if the Bureau of Reclamation were to have to depend on a hostile private utility to transmit power to operate the facilities of the Central Valley project itself.

But here is evidence without qualification that supports the proposed appropriation for the steam plant and the transmission lines, which it seems has been disregarded.

First, supporting these two items was the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted by the President of the United States.

Second came the Commissioner of Reclamation who said, "It would be a substantial advantage to install the steam plant at Antioch."

Why did they recommend these items? Mr. Page's testimony, on pages 450-451, shows that the steam plant would be a financial advantage not only to the Government but to the water users and other beneficiaries of the Central Valley project. The operation of the steam plant by the Bureau would yield net revenues of \$1,549,000 annually in excess of the offer of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. In 40 years it would mean that \$61,960,000 could be applied to the construction costs of the project and unless this income was received, this huge amount would be borne by the taxpayers of the United States or by the water users of the San Joaquin Valley and Contra Costa area or other beneficiaries.

There was another voice supporting the steam plant. It was the War Production Board. It held that the Antioch steam plant was an essential part of the ultimate development of the Central Valley project. Although unable to say "at this time when priorities could be made available for steam-station equipment to proceed with construction," the War Production Board held the plant necessary. The War Production Board was, of course, unable to commit itself on priorities in advance of an appropriation by the Congress for a steam plant or an ap-

plication by the Bureau of Reclamation for the necessary rating. Previously Shasta Dam power plant was given a rating of A-1-E to assure equipment because of the need for power for war purposes in northern California. Today that need for power is even more urgent.

This evidence, in itself emphatic enough to make me marvel at the way the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has pulled the wool over our eyes, is given still more weight by the Federal Power Commission itself. The Commission warns of the imminent shortage of power in northern California. On page 935 of the hearings Chairman Olds says of the proposed steam plant:

I think it is wise for the Government to build the steam plant.

Director Tate, of the National Defense Power Division, on page 929, also warns of critical power shortages in the Central Valley region. Although he counts additions to capacities from Shasta and Keswick Dams, he shows the shortages will be:

	Kilowatts
1943.....	285,000
1944.....	105,000
1945.....	215,000
1946.....	245,000

You and I know that the Central Valley project was authorized as a means of improving navigation, providing flood protection, supplying supplemental irrigation water for hard-pressed farmers, municipal and industrial supplies, and—

For the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes.

There has been appropriated \$110,950,000 toward the construction of the project estimated to cost \$264,990,000.

I emphasize that the steam plant is essential to the economic operation of the project. Because of the fluctuating flow of the Sacramento River stand-by facilities are necessary to make the output available at all times and more valuable.

This seems to be a last-ditch fight on the part of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to block the United States Government in the exercise of its rights to market the power of the Central Valley project as intended by the Congress when it reauthorized this project in 1937. The company has consistently opposed the Central Valley project when it threatened to invade its monopolistic domain in northern California. It has supported the project only with a string to any concessions it has made.

It now offers what is termed a fair profit to the Government on all of the power Shasta Dam will produce.

But from the statement of Commissioner Page, it would seem that the United States Government is being asked to hand over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. more than \$60,000,000 over a period of 40 years. For that is the amount of additional revenue that will be derived by the project if the steam plant and power line are built. Not only that, but it does not say what its profit will be from transferring the Government's own power from Shasta Dam to the pumping system for the San Joaquin Valley.

For my part if there is to be any profit to anyone in the Central Valley power operations, I prefer that it should go to the United States Treasury and to relieve the hard-pressed farmers of the San Joaquin Valley of heavy water charges. Without the net revenue which will come from operation of the steam plant and transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation, the costs of the Central Valley project must be borne by the United States Treasury or by the water users and other beneficiaries.

The belated offer of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to give the Government a profit on Central Valley power is, in my judgment, prompted primarily by the company's desire to prevent the people of the city of Sacramento and other communities from operating their own electric distribution systems and using Shasta Dam power for this purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fort Peck project, Montana: For commencement of construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation for proper reception, handling, transmitting, and dispatching of electric energy produced at the Fort Peck project, as authorized by the act approved May 18, 1938, entitled "An act to authorize the completion, maintenance, and operation of the Fort Peck project for navigation, and for other purposes," (52 Stat. 403), \$499,475, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which amount shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed \$10,000) and for all other objects of expenditure as specified hereinbefore in this act under the heading "Administrative provisions and limitations" appearing under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation," but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question. This amount, as I understand it, is entirely for the purpose of keeping a contract authorization that was passed in the bill last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it the obligations are expected to be incurred before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Again the gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. And it is not new money or a new project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the item just referred to makes provision for building and constructing transmission lines from Fort Peck Dam to as far east as Williston, N. Dak., and as far south as Glendive, Mont. The civil functions War Department bill recently passed by the Congress carried the sum of \$1,300,000 for the purpose of building generators. The generators will, of course, serve no useful purpose without these transmission lines. It is now known that we have large deposits of strategic minerals, notable among them chromite, in the southern part of

Montana. It is necessary that power be developed at Fort Peck just as quickly as possible to the end that these deposits may be made use of during this war period, and I am mighty grateful to the committee for including this amount in the bill.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. Let me say that the gentleman has faithfully, carefully, and conscientiously guarded the interests of the State of Montana and this particular item of the Fort Peck Dam and the transmission line, and he has brought it to the attention of the House so much, and I think we understand it so completely, that he need have no fear it is going to be defeated.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is not this Fort Peck Dam the one they had so much difficulty finishing because a part of it washed out?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. RICH. If they further increase the size of the dam and raise its height, what is the likelihood that some day another part of it will wash out, causing great destruction and loss of property?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is, of course, the largest dirt dam in the world; the longest, the highest, and the widest. There is always the possibility that anything might happen, but very little probability. It is just as likely that some other type of construction will go out. This is one of the best built dams in the world, and I believe there is no danger whatever.

Mr. RICH. It went out before, and they claim it is likely to go out again.

Mr. O'CONNOR. When it went out before it was under construction.

I have actively supported the requests for reclamation appropriations because I feel that only through increased use of western land resources by means of irrigation can the Western States be built into their just place in the national economy.

The contribution of our Western States to the war, in an agricultural sense, is largely dependent upon irrigation. In the matter of sugar beets alone, irrigated agriculture represents 75 percent of the total crop. Montana's sugar-beet acreage could be doubled with adequate irrigation water and with the necessary increase in refining facilities.

The program of developing western land and water resources must be continuously prosecuted in all stages, from the first preliminary investigation to fruition in the form of the projects ready for actual settlement.

Because I realize the significance of long-time planning for reclamation, I regret indeed that a reduction of \$550,000 has been made in the Interior supply bill item covering investigative work of the Bureau of Reclamation. I know, for instance, how critical is the need for investigative work in my own State of Montana. The selection of storage sites that will provide dependable water supplies to irrigated lands, generate some power, and yet be feasible in an economic sense is a

complex job. It requires not only the physical scientist's skills in hydrology and engineering, but also the combination of these skills with the reasoning of economists and the experience of agriculturalists, if the project is to accomplish the objective of sound community building. Initial investigations are but the beginning of the job, and yet that beginning has been curtailed. How, I ask, is it proposed that the Bureau of Reclamation prepare itself for a full-scale program after the war, if we limit its authority for laying the groundwork now? We are going to need the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in post-war years. We will need it not only for the continued, progressive job it has been doing in building western agriculture and industry, but perhaps even more for the opportunity it will provide for a soundly conceived public-works program. A public-works program to fill dinner buckets, gentlemen.

Montana has not been particularly favored by the Federal Government in its reclamation work. In fact, we have some reason for a statement that we have been sadly overlooked. Fort Peck is the only Federal dam of any size in the State, and its purpose so far has been power production.

I should like to see irrigation pushed, just as far as the supplies of critical materials will let us go. We cannot abandon irrigated agriculture permanently for battleships, even in war. The battleships and planes must be manned, and men have to eat. Irrigated agriculture is an essential link in the chain of agricultural supplies, a link that must not be permitted to wear through if we are to win the war.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Labor and services of enemy aliens and of all American-born Japanese who are under the control of the War Department or other Federal agency may be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior in the construction of water conservation and utilization projects under such regulations and conditions as the War Department or other Federal agency exercising said control may prescribe and in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider as read that portion of the bill beginning at the top of page 81 and ending with line 10 on page 104.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have never permitted, when I have been on the floor, an appropriation bill, or any part of it, to be considered as read.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These are two items to which the committee agreed.

Mr. TABER. I have no doubt but that there will be no amendments, but I think we will get along faster to do it in the regular way.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object. The Clerk read as follows:

Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays, and alunite (national defense): For all expenses necessary

to the conduct of investigations and research on processes for production of alumina from siliceous bauxites, aluminum clays, and alunite, including all necessary laboratory research; maintenance and operation of small subcommercial plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; construction and equipment of a building to house testing and subcommercial plant units; engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building and plant units; purchase of supplies and equipment; travel expenses; purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriters, adding and computing machines, professional and scientific books and publications; purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for protection of employees engaged in their work, \$93,925: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON: Page 97, line 4, after the word "aluminum" insert the words "and alumina."

Line 7, after the word "alumina" insert the words "and aluminum."

Line 11, after the word "of" strike out the words "a building" and insert the word "buildings."

Line 22, after the word "work" strike out "\$93,925" and insert "\$743,925 to be immediately available."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because of the well-known and acknowledged shortage of aluminum for our national defense purposes. Some of our plants are only operating at about 35 to 50 percent capacity, due to the shortage of aluminum. We are at present dependent to a great extent for our aluminum supply on the bauxite of South America. We are all aware of the difficulty this country is experiencing now in getting that bauxite transported to our shores through the Caribbean waters.

The Bureau of Mines has requested that we increase this appropriation in order to explore all the possibilities of producing aluminum from low-grade ores, of which I am informed we have quite an abundance.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Did the Bureau of Mines approve this amendment the gentleman has offered?

Mr. WILSON. The Bureau absolutely has approved it and are recommending it. It has been recommended by mem-

bers of the War Production Board, whom I cannot quote at this time because I have not been able to get in touch with them this afternoon in order to get permission to quote them.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman produce for the committee's enlightenment the communication from the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I have it before me now.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This is a very important amendment and one which I think should be thoroughly considered.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, upon reading this bill and noting the allowance in the bill for experimental work, and knowing of the aluminum shortage, I want to call to the attention of this body some large deposits of very rich aluminum ore. I know of an area of 78 square miles in my district which has been recommended by the Geological Survey as an area under which there is a vein of kaolin from 4 to 15 feet thick, and I have been informed by a reliable authority that this vein of kaolin will yield about 50 percent alumina. There is power available on the site for extracting the alumina from this ore.

We do not know how long we are going to be able to provide our defense plants with even a fair amount of aluminum, so I went to the Bureau of Mines and asked them if the amount of money provided in the bill was sufficient to carry on the necessary experimentation to explore these sources and develop the chemical processes and do the research work necessary to extract this aluminum, and the Bureau said, "Absolutely not."

Since I have had about 70 hours of science and have done a lot of research work, I know the amount of time and work required to carry on research. I also know that we may waste millions of dollars exploring raw-material sources and in producing defense materials by some inferior means, means that have not been thoroughly experimented with and developed. If we can foresee this thing and develop better processes and establish the most efficient chemical processes for extracting alumina from low-grade ores, we may be better able to arm our men and perhaps save our country millions of dollars.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We would have been grateful if the gentleman had come before the committee and offered this testimony so we could have included it in the bill, if it is essential.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry but I did not have an opportunity, since I did not know of it in time.

Mr. RICH. What has the gentleman from the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. WILSON. I have a statement I could read, but I will not have time to read it.

Mr. RICH. Was it a recommendation from the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. WILSON. It is a statement by the Bureau in answer to a letter which I addressed to them yesterday.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment. I have been working on this proposition for a long time and I talked to the Bureau of Mines about it several times.

We have not enough high-grade bauxite in this country to last for 2 years and if the high-grade aluminum ore in South America were shut off today, we would soon find ourselves out of aluminum. It is a very serious situation.

We do have large deposits of low-grade bauxite and large deposits of aluminum-bearing clay. They all have to be worked by a different process from that now used in processing the high-grade bauxite in Arkansas. I took this matter up with the Bureau of Mines and introduced a bill providing for \$100,000, but they came back and said that was not enough, that they would need a great deal more than that, that they would have to have pilot plants; probably two of them, one to extract alumina from clay and one for the low-grade bauxite. They have found those formulas and are now ready to use them.

We are having our vessels sunk today all around the coast of South America. What is called the Dragon's Mouth in between the West Indies islands and the coast of Venezuela has been virtually closed now. If the Windward Passage should become closed and then the Florida Strait, we might be entirely shut off from this bauxite supply in South America.

The Bureau of Mines is extremely anxious to have this increase. The reason I did not offer this amendment was that I thought it was too late, and we would have to get the item placed in the bill in the Senate. But I do hope the committee will accept this amendment. If I did not think it was necessary, and vitally necessary, I would not have risen to support it. The situation is serious, and the administration knows it is serious. This is our only chance to replenish our supply of alumina in case our supply in South America should be shut off. So I trust the committee will accept the amendment and that the House will adopt it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that the committee is sympathetic with his desire to furnish an additional source of alumina, but the customary method of handling appropriations is first to have an item recommended by the Bureau that will do the work, second, to have it presented to the Budget, which goes over the detail, and third, to send it to the committee, which carefully examines the pros and cons as to making the appropriation.

In this particular case, I suggest to the gentleman that he get a recommendation from the Bureau of Mines, which I believe he already has, then present it to the Budget, and then take it over to the Senate and have it incorporated in the bill during the Senate hearings. That is the orderly, systematic procedure. If we followed any other method, we would have more or less chaos and confusion by attempting to write an appropriation measure on the floor without having previous investigation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is a mining engineer and he was responsible for this provision being put in the appropriation bill in the first place; was he not?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. To a large degree.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. In the gentleman's opinion, should we carry on more research work and do it immediately to find out some efficient method for extracting this low-grade ore?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I am entirely sympathetic with the objective, and I think it will be done.

Mr. WILSON. Does the gentleman believe the amount in the bill is sufficient?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The amount in the bill is sufficient for the skilled personnel which is now available.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The Bureau of Mines says not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read down to and including line 10 on page 104.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, 1943 (H. R. 6845), had come to no resolution thereon.

PRODUCTION OF WINES, BRANDY, AND FRUIT SPIRITS

Mr. BUCK submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions.

CASES UNDER THE EXPEDITING ACT OF FEBRUARY 11, 1903

Mr. McLAUGHLIN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6005) to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts consti-

tuted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee handling the War Department civil functions appropriation bill have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that when we come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow we are going on with the consideration of the bill we have had under consideration today.

Mr. COCHRAN. Either that bill or the conference report on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a short article from the Reclamation Era.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a brief statement I made before the appropriations subcommittee and also to include a letter from Commissioner Page and a letter from Secretary Ickes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] may be given an indefinite leave of absence on the advice of the physician at the Capitol, due to illness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a letter I have addressed to Mr. Nelson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on today I have a special order to address the House for 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the regular business of the day has been transacted, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, in lieu of the special order I have for today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a guest editorial by Ralph E. Ammon, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, appearing in the Wisconsin State Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table of profits of individual corporations for 1940 and 1941, showing the percentage of increase for 1941.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the regular business of the day and following any previous special order, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter to me from Maxey Jarman, president of the General Shoe Corporation, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial in the magazine The Cross and the Flag.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made a week ago yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include short newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, in each of which I ask unanimous consent to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JEWISH ARMY IN PALESTINE

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in an apprehensive statement, Prime Minister Churchill told the united forces today that "we are likely to lose the war unless we use our combined overwhelming strength and use the multiplying opportunities that will present themselves to us." I want to call to the attention of the Prime Minister the fact that the Committee for a Jewish Army has pointed out repeatedly that there is in Palestine and other Middle East countries a manpower capable of supplying an army of approximately 200,000 Jews ready to fight with the valor that is characteristic of those who are defending their homelands. The immediate mobilization of these people must suggest itself as a wise course to all who want to see America win this war quickly. Many of our generals and our admirals tell us that such an army is essential to the protection of the Suez Canal. I do not know whether or not we are sending any men into that section of the globe now, but I venture to assert that it is only a question of a few weeks when American boys will be sent to Palestine to protect that region. Obviously there is an available army there now; a fierce army of traditional soldiers, for the Jewish people have, throughout the history of their existence, been a fighting people. Why not use it? The Jews were the first victims of Hitler. They want to fight. Why not let them fight, and in that way reserve our men for other important sections?

For some reason the United Nations have failed to take advantage of this ready manpower. Therefore I respectfully suggest that the President of the United States, at the earliest possible date, negotiate with the British Government in an effort to utilize this manpower. And I further suggest that he assign an American general to the task of effectively using this army, in the hope that military considerations will prevail

and that we may drive on to victory and realize in the shortest possible time the complete destruction of the despotic forces that we are called upon to fight.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield back the 10 minutes of the special order granted to me today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. STEPHEN RAUSHENBUSH

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair suggests there are other special orders on the Calendar that must first be taken care of.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the attacks made yesterday on Mr. Raushenbush, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from him written to me today, and also a letter from Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, written to Secretary Ickes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a very interesting and informative article in yesterday's Washington Star relative to the pending measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRODUCTION OF WAR MATERIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the country is hearing a great deal from administration spokesmen these days about how production of war machines and munitions is being stepped up. There are also charges of slowdowns here and there. A grave danger—grave because it is insidious—confronts this country. It is time that it be pointed out. The technique of the bureaucrats, in those months when they should have had production and were not getting it, was to emphasize in all of their propaganda in the press, over the radio, through the motion pictures, and from the platform, the tremendous sums being appropriated and authorized.

The effort was made to convince the country that in some way appropriations and authorizations meant what only actual production could accomplish, and what was not being accomplished at the time.

We are now hearing much about production. If we are getting the production administration spokesmen say we are, the country can thank God for that. It still remains a fact, however, that reputable observers in Washington say it takes as much as 2 weeks in many cases for orders issued by the War Production Board to reach the governmental agencies which are to carry out those orders although, in many instances, the agencies are not two blocks away. That, however, is only a part of the grave danger which confronts this Nation. The rest of it is this:

Appropriations are only a preliminary step, necessary as they are. Authorizations are only a preliminary step, necessary as they are. Specifications are only a preliminary step, necessary as they are. Letting of contracts is only a preliminary step, necessary as that is. Production is the most important step in that succession of steps, but production is not the final step. The final, absolute, vital step which effectuates all of these previous steps is the delivery of these machines and munitions of war to our fighting men, and the fighting men of our allies, at the points where those machines and munitions are needed, and to get them there in time and in ample quantity.

If this final, vital step fails, if the machines and implements of war are not delivered to our fighting forces at the points needed in time and in sufficient quantities, all these previous steps of appropriations, authorizations, specifications, contracts, and production become ineffective and meaningless.

The evidence is accumulating in Washington that these machines and munitions are not being delivered at the points where they are needed by our fighting forces and our allied fighting forces in time and in sufficient quantities.

The administration has had all the money it has asked for. The Congress has appropriated billions piled upon billions. To date, Mr. Roosevelt has asked the American people, through Congress, for more than \$160,000,000,000 to spend on this war. The President has been the recipient of powers piled upon powers. Twenty-two months have passed. The American people are demanding to know, and well may they demand to know, Where is the production? Why are the machines and munitions not being delivered to the points where they are needed, desperately needed, in time and in sufficient quantities?

America cannot defeat her enemies with words, propaganda, appropriations, authorizations, specifications, contracts, or production, so long as those machines and implements and munitions remain in warehouses in the United States. The people of America must demand with an insistence unending that the delivery of these machines and munitions be accomplished forthwith.

We have General MacArthur's warning that too little, too late, means betrayal and death for the boys in the fighting lines and defeat and enslavement for America.

America demands, and America will get, that delivery of enough in time, or they will know the reason why. The American people are now determined that

no bureaucrat, that no partisan political consideration—nothing—shall stand between this Nation and its security, and between civilization and the threat of its extinction by brutal, ruthless, murderous marauders.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], I ask unanimous consent that he may be granted permission to extend his own remarks and include two newspaper articles and a letter addressed to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a table and a number of letters I have received from members of the Cabinet and chiefs of various governmental activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ECONOMY IN NONDEFENSE ITEMS A VITAL NECESSITY—NATION'S PRINTING BILL A GOOD PLACE TO START

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might present a progress report on an effort I am trying to initiate to cut the enormous printing and binding costs of the United States Government. This is only one of innumerable places where the economy knife must be inserted deeply if we are to do our duty and carry out the wishes of the American people. But it is a good place to make a beginning.

A general, all-around reduction of non-defense expenditures has become not only a duty but a necessity. There is no use blinking at the facts and trying to convince ourselves that we can have all of the comforts and conveniences, the frills, and pet schemes and extravagances of peacetime and total war at the same time. They simply do not mix.

We are in a desperate war to preserve human freedom and the American way of life. Personally, I think it is going to be a long war. There is certainly nothing to indicate otherwise, with Japan entrenched in the Far East and Hitler in possession of Europe's "bread basket." As it continues it will draw more and more on America's vital resources. Our debt has mounted spectacularly until with existing commitments it is around \$125,000,000,000. The last official estimates we have place the total wealth of the United States between \$250,000,000,000 and \$300,000,000,000. Since those estimates were made several years ago, our wealth has grown and the increase might now conceivably bring the total up to around \$375,000,000,000. If in less than 4 months of war our national debt already amounts to one-third of the national wealth, what in Heaven's name will we be using for money to carry on the war 10 years from now?

CONGRESS NOT YET ECONOMY CONSCIOUS

As a Member of Congress trying to grasp the realism of the thing, I believe our national lawmaking body is not yet conscious of the cutting that will have to be done in our nondefense expenditures. I believe it has not yet even begun to be conscious of the drastic curtailments which are bound to come and which we will be compelled to put into effect in every kind and character of appropriation not associated with the war effort. I think that we in Congress will have to be shaken into a realization that we cannot have nondefense appropriations as usual and total war at the same time, and I believe the American people are about ready to do the shaking. My conclusion that the Congress is not aware of what it is up against in this respect is strengthened when I behold the numerous nondefense bills now pending to drain the United States Treasury of resources which must be conserved to carry on the war effort. Conspicuous among these is the rivers and harbors bill, carrying nearly a billion dollars, with a prospect that hundreds of millions more will be added to it if it ever reaches the stage of amendment in the House and Senate. This bill includes the indefensible St. Lawrence seaway scheme and the grandiose project to bisect the State of Florida with a ship canal, and various other ancient and fantastic measures to breach the Treasury. It is unthinkable to me that in the present state of our national finances and with the drain that war places on the Nation, such a squandering of money for non-defense, nonessential projects should even be considered for a moment, and yet we find it before us backed by a favorable committee report. When I see the big crop of nondefense Treasury tapping measures budding and flowering as usual and asking to be watered by American dollars, I wonder if we have really awakened to the fact that we are at war.

FIFTY-ONE UNOPENED GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

My purpose in arising, however, was not so much to call attention to the general picture of war financing and needed economies as to advise the Congress and the country of my inquiry into the cost of printing and binding by governmental departments and the savings which I hope may be effectuated in that particular line of economy. We are all familiar with the Gargantuan outpouring of Government documents of every imaginable variety and description, some modest and others ornate, printed on costly calendered paper and embellished with illustrations. Some of these publications have been printed in colors, which adds largely to their cost. One Government official, who is opposed to this waste, told me about an acquaintance of his, a businessman who, on examining the contents of a wastebasket in his office, found 51 Government publications, all in their original wrappers. At this point I desire to submit for printing in the RECORD a statement showing the amounts expended for printing and binding by the executive departments and agencies and Congress during the fiscal years 1939, 1940, 1941, and the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1942, as follows:

	1939	1940	1941	First 6 month 1942
Congress	\$2,700,000.00	\$2,987,378.23	\$3,557,568.21	\$2,110,867.99
The Federal Register	120,000.00	112,621.77	162,431.79	78,189.40
Code of Federal Regulations		88,147.05	125,283.45	
Private orders by Members of Congress:				
Documents, reports, bill, etc.	20,338.23	12,815.12	26,621.07	5,751.04
Speeches	60,488.47	97,820.99	77,752.00	23,296.07
Other private orders	1,797.44	4,771.01	2,553.27	469.16
Superintendent of Documents	727,986.55	850,181.66	1,198,259.33	561,622.14
Library of Congress	468,536.23	542,168.15	550,885.07	238,174.70
Agriculture	1,447,208.19	1,950,909.85	2,433,426.86	960,792.12
Commerce	534,740.84	1,065,234.84	1,022,895.28	672,324.52
Interior	861,599.48	662,429.63	778,322.86	236,982.73
Justice	403,675.07	434,112.69	712,094.58	297,636.16
Labor	603,222.36	412,575.18	488,806.54	182,057.88
Navy	714,731.04	1,002,814.31	2,158,284.18	1,344,088.45
Post Office	1,881,791.91	2,046,122.52	2,213,324.63	1,074,878.85
State	215,082.82	204,219.23	259,048.55	102,183.58
Treasury	1,521,430.92	1,552,952.87	2,044,042.26	1,794,259.03
War	733,390.64	1,129,732.64	5,244,316.58	3,442,136.93
Administrative Office, Export Control			34,858.43	7,810.25
Administrative Office, U. S. Courts				29,481.01
Advisory Committee for Council of National Defense		326.92		
Agricultural Adjustment Administration	538,877.76	100,834.25	1,462.26	
Alien Property Custodian	(1)	(1)		
Alley Dwelling Authority	550.75	1,146.94	2,138.12	953.70
American Battle Monuments Commission	22,019.29	239.50	2,878.95	2,526.51
Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission		18.39		
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	2,584.16	1,092.52	1,328.36	3,422.82
Board of Investigation and Research				178.55
Board of Tax Appeals	30,383.63	31,218.00	36,697.20	18,983.30
Bureau of the Budget	38,277.04	44,946.31	50,901.93	2,611.65
Canal Zone Biological Laboratory				1.58
Central Statistical Board			1,468.63	147.15
Civil Aeronautics Authority	41,605.63	89,565.52	24,169.10	1,369.93
Civil Service Commission	128,732.36	155,315.91	353,364.70	181,557.73
Civilian Conservation Corps	40,030.18	9,565.47	2.28	
Commission of Fine Arts	406.20	351.48	197.86	247.51
Commodity Credit Corporation	59,531.05	19,712.52		
Coordinator of Information		26.35		6,099.43
Council of Personnel Administration				
Court of Claims	27,211.75	29,110.81	24,037.06	10,953.20
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	5,733.63	6,029.77	6,407.32	7,248.67
District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia	264.72			
District of Columbia government	83,900.54	78,394.76	75,959.63	27,849.42
Economic Defense Board				136.48
Electric Home and Farm Authority	587.04	2,482.33		
Employees' Compensation Commission	41,412.71	30,605.38	32,326.41	9,906.50
Export Control			3,874.27	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	308.18	263.06		
Farm Credit Administration	104,424.25	131,784.76	131,456.21	60,040.19
Farm Security Administration	158,536.49	161,373.46	195,275.00	107,265.52
Federal Alcohol Administration	12.00	12.00		
Federal Board for Vocational Education	(1)	(1)		
Federal Communications Commission	42,360.59	40,063.35	58,809.20	12,543.18
Federal Coordinator of Industrial Cooperation			11,836.99	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	8,942.77	8,786.90	8,945.49	2,608.92
Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works	134,250.44	26,121.50		
Federal Emergency Relief Administration	50.70			
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	14,238.56	4,821.33		
Federal Housing Administration	306,389.47	87,235.38		
Federal Loan Agency		247,452.57	376,219.01	158,518.94
Federal Power Commission	39,563.14	75,720.92	58,494.33	13,123.68
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance	1,343.48	17.41		
Federal Security Agency		465,935.09	853,109.48	387,821.10
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation	16,784.90	10,684.94		
Federal Trade Commission	62,872.31	83,376.06	70,905.08	24,524.79
Federal Works Agency		411,021.94	450,505.04	215,910.71
General Accounting Office	101,002.96	103,108.88	110,895.34	67,340.65
Geographic Board	(1)	(1)		
George Washington Bicentennial Commission	13,103.42			
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	44,813.69	12,425.56		
Inland Waterways Corporation	18.50	497.29		
Interstate Commerce Commission	209,920.77	245,207.83	245,360.95	109,442.98
Maritime Labor Board	493.32	388.37	2,576.49	4.44
National Academy of Science	187.10	191.02	299.09	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	19,199.55	25,031.36	26,797.11	9,716.69
National Archives	12,476.92	19,395.05	13,100.69	5,222.86
National Bituminous Coal Commission	36,002.66	12,007.50	9,439.66	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	73.18	27.92	63.49	31.99
National Emergency Council	38,870.95	1,429.37		
National Forest Reservation Commission	797.03	696.03	680.00	52.51
National Gallery of Art	743.38	424.36	4,935.43	6,281.57
National Labor Relations Board	91,423.78	157,015.01	135,299.54	56,146.64
National Mediation Board	2,669.80	2,117.73	2,874.46	770.10
National Railroad Adjustment Board	36,117.73	380.16	1,108.07	50.05
National Resources Planning Board		2,984.10	19,157.55	9,038.42
National Unemployment Administration	23,193.14			
Northwest Territory Celebration Commission	4.25			
Office for Emergency Management			125,050.57	328,884.29
Office of Government Reports		20,010.82	43,750.49	20,220.26
Office of Production Management			78,331.66	108,357.11
Pan American Union	27,701.24	36,095.92	31,806.39	16,429.39
Panama Canal	6,679.82	14,096.44	20,524.33	9,570.64
Patent Office	789,740.72	873,767.22	908,171.25	343,361.75
Prison Industries Reorganization	45.09			
Public Buildings and Public Parks	(1)	(1)		
Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration	2,900.65	2,850.36	501.87	177.68
Railroad Administration	33.51			
Railroad Retirement Board	27,751.88	113,210.09	100,464.40	53,279.73
Real Estate Commission, District of Columbia		14.34		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	160,374.24	76,234.43	16,535.30	
Resettlement Administration	.50			
Rural Electrification Administration	74,665.08	23,505.90	7.95	
Securities and Exchange Commission	100,930.90	135,415.36	131,103.56	56,996.96
Selective Service System			280,164.62	71,515.41
Shipping Board	(1)	(1)		

1 In Justice.

2 In Interior.

3 In Commerce.

	1939	1940	1941	First 6 months 1942
Smithsonian Institution.....	\$56,463.03	\$58,576.79	\$65,194.56	\$37,832.02
Social Security Board.....	256,633.89	81,247.63	7,214.34
Supreme Court, United States.....	10,949.56	6,357.92	8,290.29	6,147.94
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	57,778.70	45,887.25	44,991.27	19,197.29
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission.....	315.99	298.11	98.68
United States Committee for the Celebration, 200th Anniversary, Birth of Thomas Jefferson.....
United States Commissioner Paris International Exposition.....
United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.....	1,425.03	5,435.00
United States Coronado Exposition.....	32.52
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.....	1,754.27
United States Customs Court.....	21.32
United States Golden Gate International Exposition.....	953.94	197.46
U. S. Housing Authority.....	39,895.06	10,226.96
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	39,170.09	45,516.17	43,009.74	39,517.32
U. S. New York World's Fair Commission.....	1,569.26
U. S. Tariff Commission.....	25,665.07	19,769.36	16,489.50	15,941.00
Veterans' Administration.....	131,967.54	143,594.77	155,741.58	60,837.43
War Finance Corporation.....	14.95
White House.....	5,552.45	5,699.91	7,372.33	3,672.45
Works Progress Administration.....	817,902.04	240,170.32	2,787.62
Commodore Perry Commission.....	114.00
Grand total, printing, binding, and blank paper.....	18,238,045.10	20,150,203.72	28,593,638.71	15,864,603.65

OVER-ALL PRINTING COSTS

This table shows graphically how the cost of printing and binding has grown from \$18,238,045.10 in 1939 to \$28,593,638.71 in 1941, an increase of over \$10,000,000 in 2 years, with a prospect of a further increase to about \$32,000,000 in the fiscal year 1942.

But this does not begin to tell the story of the financial obligation on the Government incurred on account of printing and binding. The various documents that are printed have first to be written and edited and a large personnel is required in their preparation. This entails a cost equal to or greater than the cost of printing and binding. Then there is the amount of postage that is lost by reason of the fact that these documents are mailed free to the four corners of the earth. The amount of postage lost on penalty—departmental—mail in the fiscal year 1941 was \$49,020,190.

That is to say, if postage on this matter had been collected at the usual rates, the amount would have been \$49,020,190; but it is only fair to explain that the actual cost of handling the penalty mail, according to cost ascertainment figures, was \$19,717,000 in that year. It is reasonable, I think, to assume that the cost of preparing and editing manuscripts intended for printing, the actual cost of the printing and binding and the cost of the handling of departmental and congressional printed matter under frank is in excess of \$85,000,000 a year.

MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR FOR HEARINGS

It will surprise the general public and, I think, many Members of Congress to learn that the cost of printing and binding of congressional hearings is a million dollars a year. To be exact, the estimate of this item for the fiscal year 1942 is \$1,055,000, and the actual cost for the fiscal year 1941 was \$968,316.

This is the sheer printing and binding cost and does not include the pay of the stenographers who report the hearings or any other incidental charges. The cost of one hearing, that of the Civil Liberties Committee, was \$296,000. Think of it. A vast amount of the testimony taken down by the official stenographers and printed in committee hearings is

repetitious and inconsequential. How to reduce the cost of committee hearings is a problem. One suggestion is that competent clerks be employed to make a condensation or syllabus of important parts of the testimony and that such syllabus only be printed. But there the human factor enters, and what one person would regard as important enough to be printed another might omit altogether.

Another suggestion is that hearings be taken down by stenographers and transcripts of the testimony be placed on file with the committee and made accessible to everybody, but that the printing of the hearings be dispensed with. This would cut down the cost of congressional committee printing at least 90 percent, but it would do away with the general and widespread publicity of committee proceedings, which is believed to be in the public interest.

LETTER TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

On February 12 last, I sent to every member of the Cabinet and the head of every important United States Government activity the following letter:

DEAR MR. —: As a member of the Appropriations Committee, still interested in economy notwithstanding the colossal overshadowing expenditures that are necessary for national defense, I am writing to invite your attention to a matter which, while seemingly of relative unimportance, bears possibilities, I believe, of substantial dividends in national morale, as well as in actual savings.

Everywhere the people are expressing a willingness to bow their backs to any tax impositions that may be necessary to win the war, but they are not only insisting but demanding that waste and extravagance in every conceivable form shall be eliminated from our national expenditures.

I am writing respectfully to request that you make a study of the paper and printing needs of your establishment to see if it will not be possible to effectuate worth-while savings in your paper and printing bill. One Government commission has been able to save thousands of dollars by changing its press releases from a daily to a weekly basis, printing on both sides of the paper and adopting other similar reforms to conserve paper and reduce printing costs.

If this example were followed generally throughout the Government, the saving in money would be substantial, but more important still would be the heartening effect

on public morale. The people would construe this conservation effort as an indication that the practice of economy is not a lost art in Government operations and they would be cheered and encouraged.

I will be most appreciative if you will advise me whether it will be possible for you to make such a survey as I have suggested.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Mr. Speaker, the replies to this communication have been most gratifying. My suggestion that printing and binding costs be overhauled and that a critical study be made to ascertain how the same may be reduced has met instant and favorable reaction from all of those to whom the letter was sent. Without exception, sincere and complete cooperation is promised to bring down these costs. I believe that the spirit of cooperation which is being manifested should soon result in a saving of many millions of dollars a year to the taxpayers.

The replies I have received from heads of governmental activities and accompanying data in support of a real economy move to cut down the Nation's printing and binding bill would fill one whole issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Obviously I can submit only a small fraction of them for publication. The following communications are presented to show the fine spirit of cooperation manifested by the heads of all departments and agencies.

SECRETARY HULL

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 18, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have your letter of February 12, 1942, expressing your interest in the possibility of effecting worth-while savings in the Federal Government in expenditures for paper and printing.

In this connection you may be assured that I shall be very glad to cooperate with you in making a survey with a view to effecting economies wherever possible. In fact, I might add that such a survey with respect to the use of paper and other stationery supplies is now under way in the Department, and I expect within the next few days to inaugurate certain procedures which will aid materially in keeping expenditures for these items to a minimum.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

SECRETARY JONES

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 3, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: We are in hearty accord with the suggestion contained in your letter that war economy and public morale demand a critical check of Government paper and printing needs. The economies suggested as well as additional curtailments were put in force throughout the Department some time ago.

The Department's publications committee, representative of each bureau, division, and other issuing agency, made a comprehensive study of all printing, processing, and use of paper, and other supplies. All publications not considered essential in the face of the present emergency are being eliminated. All production must conform to a rule of strict economy in the use of paper and other supplies and man-hours required. All distribution which has no bearing on the war effort is being eliminated, and all lists have been carefully checked. Consolidation and other savings are being effected as rapidly as possible. Last September we emphasized the saving of paper by use of both sides and single-spacing of the typing. All files have been checked and where not deemed of immediate or historic value were recommended to the Committee of Congress on Disposition of Executive Papers for disposal. This will not only conserve paper but release space.

Your interest and courtesy in writing are appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

MR. KEYSERLING

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY,
Washington, February 23, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: In reply to your letter of February 12, I wish to assure you that I am wholly in agreement with the thoughts expressed therein, and you are advised that a survey such as you suggest, looking toward worth-while savings in our paper and printing bill, will be made.

Since the beginning, economy has been and must of necessity be the watchword of the United States Housing Authority because it is constantly striving to reduce construction and operating costs, as well as administrative expenses, in carrying out its low-cost housing program.

Under what is known as our waste-control policy, we have been and are continually finding ways and means to eliminate administrative expense. For your information in this connection we are enclosing copies of memoranda issued during the past few years. This year, because of the emergency, we have established unusually tight budget controls over all administrative expenses with the object of eliminating every item of expense that is not absolutely essential to the efficient operation of the Authority.

Before any office memoranda, office forms, pamphlets, technical notes, office manuals, etc., are printed or reproduced for use or distribution, approval must first be obtained from our Budget and Planning Division, which takes into consideration such things as the purpose to be served, quantity to be ordered, method of reproduction used, distribution, present need, number of pages, and the possibility of combining two or more forms, for example, so as to reduce and improve upon the number of forms in use.

At present, wherever possible, we use both sides of the paper for printing. We have also reduced the number of editions of publications issued throughout the year. To cite one example, a publication issued as a weekly

during the fiscal year 1941 was changed to a monthly and two special editions during the fiscal year 1942. As the year progressed, however, we have found it possible to reduce that number still further, so that only nine publications will be issued. The savings on that publication alone in paper, printing, and cost of distribution is approximately \$7,000.

Because of our waste-control policy, under which we are constantly striving to eliminate waste and extravagance, it is going to be somewhat difficult to effect very large savings; but you can count upon us to do our best to effect further savings in the survey which is being undertaken.

Very sincerely yours,

LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Acting Administrator.

PAUL V. McNUTT
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, February 20, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LOUIE: I have your letter of February 12, 1942, asking my cooperation in making a survey to the end that economies may be effected in our paper and printing needs.

May I say at the outset that I am in complete agreement with the objectives you suggest, and for sometime past we have been trying to cut corners wherever possible. Specifically, we have established the policy of not only using both sides of the paper but also single spacing every duplicating job except, of course, in particular instances where this is not feasible. I have had established in my office for several months a central printing and duplicating committee whose responsibility it is to review each request for duplicating or printing service submitted by not only the constituent organizations of this Agency, but also the members of my immediate staff, with a view to determining whether or not the material is absolutely essential to the efficient operation of our business. Also, though it might seem a small item from a conservation standpoint, instructions have been issued to the entire staff that rewrites of letters are to be ordered only when absolutely necessary to insure clarity or correct misstatements, and in such cases only the originals are rewritten with changes made in ink on all carbon copies. In this connection, too, it has been ordered that the individual offices survey their correspondence procedures to the end that as many copies as are not absolutely necessary to the proper function of their office be eliminated.

Other than the above you no doubt are familiar with the fact that the Government Printing Office has recently asked the co-operation of the Federal departments and agencies in adopting several different sizes of letterheads, it being their idea that half-sized sheets be used for short letters, thus conserving the paper supply. I need not tell you that we are extending our every cooperation, and further than this we are also adopting similar-sized sheets for our inter-office correspondence.

As can be seen from this explanation, we are pursuing every effort to economize on this phase of our operation, but so far as showing an actual saving in dollars and cents, I am doubtful that this can be done at the present time on account of the fact that the war effort has considerably increased the load of our duplicating facilities. An economy actually does not exist by virtue of these measures we have adopted, although they might not be readily reflected in our appropriation figure for this function. Let me assure you that we are giving this matter very careful attention and those compiling our budget are keeping this uppermost in their minds.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. McNUTT,
Administrator.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL WARREN

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 19, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives, the Capitol.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter dated February 12 did not reach me until the 17th. I read it carefully and let me assure you I am wholly in accord with your position that economy should be observed in Government operation whenever and wherever possible.

Referring to our printing and paper expense, let me say that already we have moved to conserve paper in any way possible. We make only one carbon when that will suffice, and have instructed that one envelope carry more than one letter or document sent from one of our divisions to another division, whenever possible. We are located in 18 buildings and the necessity of sending papers from one building to another daily is very great. Also, I wish to emphasize the fact that the General Accounting Office has no daily, weekly, or any other kind of press releases. Not in the whole history of the Office has a penny been spent for that purpose, nor has the Office ever submitted an estimate for funds to be used for such a purpose.

With continued high regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SECRETARY PERKINS

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 14, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Member of Congress, House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: This will acknowledge your letter of February 12, requesting a survey of the paper and printing needs of this Department with a view to effectuating "worth-while savings" in expenditures for these items. You may be assured that we shall be very glad to comply with this request.

With appreciation of this opportunity to cooperate with you, believe me,
Sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

ATTORNEY GENERAL RIDDLE

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of February 12, 1942, relative to creating economies, particularly in our paper and printing bills.

I am pleased to advise you that the Department initiated a survey along these lines a short while ago. We have issued circulars to our divisional and bureau heads and to our field offices to make a survey of all supplies and equipment they have and to return any excess over their immediate needs to the Department with a view to conserving these supplies and distributing them in an economical manner. We have also requested that all obsolete forms be used for scrap paper and that both sides of paper be used wherever it is possible.

To create further savings, we are using, where suitable, a very small type for mimeograph work, which will permit us to have many more words on the page, thus conserving paper. To reduce our printing costs, we are using a varityper wherever possible, so that the far less expensive offset printing method may be used. We are also taking steps to reduce, if possible, printing costs for

briefs and records by the use of this special form of printing.

You may be interested to know that the Department does not issue daily press releases. In fact, the only information we issue is on matters of specific public interest, and then only when absolutely necessary.

You may be assured that the Department is exploring every possible means to conserve paper and reduce printing costs. Your suggestions and interest are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

SECRETARY STIMSON

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 4, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of February 12, 1942, relative to economy in the use of paper by the War Department, is acknowledged.

You are advised that various measures have been put into effect along these lines. War Department Circular No. 214, dated October 10, 1941, directed all concerned to exercise the strictest economy in the use of paper of all kinds by (1) utilization of both sides of mimeograph paper, if possible; (2) reduction of margins to a minimum; (3) economic arrangement of subject matter; and (4) strict adherence to brevity. Circular No. 253, of December 11, 1941, amplified the earlier circular by including measures such as the careful planning as to the minimum number of copies of orders and training schedules needed and the revision of mailing lists to eliminate those uninterested.

You are assured that a continued study will be given to this problem, and suggestions for further economy will receive immediate consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

SECRETARY KNOX

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 19, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: At the present time a definite effort is being made in the Navy Department to effectuate a savings in paper and printed matter. In the Publications Division, Office of the Secretary of the Navy, a study is being made on standardization and consolidation of Navy Department forms and in this connection a definite attempt has been made to conform to standard sizes.

Furthermore, in an effort to eliminate waste and extravagance in paper and printing, a reduction in the use of rag-content paper has been made and the number of copies ordered has been curtailed. Material, insofar as it is advisable, is being printed on both sides of the paper.

You may be sure that the Navy Department will do everything possible to cooperate in the effort to conserve paper and reduce the cost of printing.

FRANK KNOX.

GEN. FRANK T. HINES

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 20, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am in receipt of your communication of February 12, 1942, relative to effecting economies in expenditures for paper and printing needs of the Veterans' Administration.

Expenditures of this nature receive the continuous attention of this Administration, and as an example of what has been accomplished our cost of printing and binding during the fiscal year 1941 was approximately \$149,000 as compared with \$228,500 for the fiscal year 1923, notwithstanding the large increase in the activities of the Veterans' Administration during this period. Our appropriation for printing and binding for the current fiscal year is \$144,250 and it may be well to state that our expenditures for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 are considerably above our normal requirements due to the costs involved in printing insurance applications, policies, and other forms required in connection with the new National Service Life Insurance.

Regarding the cost of press releases and other issues of this character, you are advised that we have a Press Relations Section, consisting of three employees. This section prepares a biweekly news bulletin and the total cost of stationery and supplies used for all purposes, including reference books and subscriptions, approximated \$258 for the last fiscal year.

Your interest in effecting economies in operation is appreciated, and you may be assured of the continued cooperation of the Veterans' Administration in this important and necessary function.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

CHAIRMAN MILLIS

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I agree with you in your letter about the importance of conserving paper and money in restricting printing.

The Board does no promotional printing. It must finance its briefs, records, appendices, etc., in connection with litigation under the act. Similarly it is required by statute to issue an annual report. It must also issue its decisions so that they may be available to the public. The only other printing is that for elections, which consists of notices of elections, ballots, etc., and the usual miscellaneous items of stationery, forms, etc. These are all kept at a minimum.

I hope that this is fully explanatory, and know that if it is not, you will feel free to call upon me for further advice.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. MILLIS.

POSTMASTER GENERAL WALKER

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This will acknowledge your communication of February 12 concerning the study to be made of the paper and printing needs for the Post Office Department.

I am now having made an extensive study on these needs which will be completed within the next week. Upon completion of this survey, I will write you fully concerning the Post Office Department's needs.

Very truly yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Further reference is made to your communication of February 12, concerning the study to be made of the paper and printing needs of the Post Office Department and to my reply of February 23, wherein

it was stated that such a study was being made and that you would be advised further on the completion of this study. I am now in a position to give you at length the results of this study.

Prior to January 20, when this Department appeared before the Committee on Appropriations with a deficiency request in the appropriation for printing and binding for the Post Office Department, I instructed the responsible officers to explain to the committee in detail the problems confronting us concerning this appropriation. After their return from the hearing I further instructed that a detailed complete investigation concerning this appropriation for the last 15 years be made and a report submitted. I am attaching herewith a copy of that report, with exhibits, and sufficient copies for distribution to all members of the committee if you see fit to so distribute them.

I believe that the report, with the exhibits, clearly sets forth the problems confronting the Post Office Department regarding this appropriation. In substance it discloses that the expenditures to a great extent are beyond the control of anyone in the Post Office Department, except as to the following:

1. Is the material ordered absolutely essential to the Postal Service?

With respect to this there is an itemized list submitted of every order and an investigation of this list will show that the material ordered is absolutely necessary to the conduct of the business of the Post Office Department.

2. Is proper check continually maintained on the quantity of forms used?

This subject is clearly covered in paragraph 3 on page 3 of the report. While you may have other ideas concerning this feature, I believe that we are now expending from other appropriation items all the money that should be spent to safeguard this feature. I am further of the opinion that the methods used are adequate and that we do not order or use more material than is absolutely necessary.

3. Is the absolute necessity for each form or other printed material ascertained?

With reference to this feature, on every occasion when a new form is ordered or a reprint of an old form is necessary, the unit ordering the form must submit an explanation as to its necessity, and before the form is printed it is passed on by a special committee on forms, attached to my office. This is covered in paragraph 4 on page 3 of the report.

4. Are the forms or other printed material made up in the most economical manner?

The committee on forms has always watched this very closely, and every known device is used to curtail expenses in the make-up of this material. A saving of \$669,651 has been made during the last 8 years. This is covered in the continuing paragraph on the top of page 4 of the report.

I dislike very much for the Department to have to go before the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee for deficiency appropriations, and have instructed all officers of the Department to submit their estimates with a view to eliminating the necessity for such requests. However, if you will read from paragraph 3 on page 5, through paragraph 6 on page 6 of the report, you will note that we have very little control over the necessity for such requests.

I am more than anxious to cooperate with the Appropriations Committee in every way possible, not only in this appropriation, but in all other appropriations of the Post Office Department. If, after reading the report of the investigation and this letter, you or the committee have any suggestions to offer I would be very glad to have them, and I assure you that such suggestions will receive my personal attention.

Very truly yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

CHAIRMAN HENDERSON
RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE
CORPORATION,
WASHINGTON, February 18, 1942.

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of February 12th, suggesting that a survey be made for the purpose of determining what savings could be made in our paper and printing needs, was brought to my attention today upon my return to the office after an absence of several days.

You may be assured that we shall be pleased to cause such a survey to be made promptly, which will include the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all affiliated agencies.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES B. HENDERSON.

LEON HENDERSON
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 4, 1942.
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This will acknowledge your letter of February 20, 1942, relative to a definite plan for conservation of paper, as well as a reduction in our printing costs.

I was indeed glad to have your views on this matter because I share wholeheartedly your opinion that such savings are necessary, both from a standpoint of national resources, as well as one of public morale, and had already asked my staff to make the necessary surveys with that objective in mind. I am unable at this time to say just when there will be anything of significance to report, but a survey of the nature you suggest is, and has been, on our schedule and will be completed just as quickly as the present load of work will permit. At such time I will let you know the results of our findings.

May I assure you that I appreciate your concern in this matter and that I shall welcome any further suggestions you may wish to submit along this line.

Very truly yours,
LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator.

SECRETARY WICKARD
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 3, 1942.
Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of February 12 raises a question which has been undergoing careful consideration in this Department for some time. One phase of the printing and paper problem, namely the use of printed forms, was the subject of intensive study by our Administrative Council during the past year. Its study pointed in the same direction as did a recent circular issued by the Bureau of the Budget which directed all departments, in the interest of economy and efficiency, to review, eliminate where possible, and standardize its several types of printed forms. Consequently I issued on February 7, 1942, a memorandum (No. 976) instructing the several Administrators, Chiefs of Bureaus, and Directors of Offices to take proper steps to accomplish this purpose. I am enclosing a copy of that memorandum.

We are just now winding up a survey of all the printed and duplicated periodicals of the Department as a basis for cutting down the number of pages, frequency of issue, number of copies issued wherever possible, and in some cases for eliminating periodicals completely. There'll be considerable saving, we believe, in the printing of periodicals as a result of this survey and the following action.

However, much of our publication of periodicals and of single bulletins is more necessary in wartime than ever before since they carry information that farm people must have in order to produce the food and fiber that the Nation must have to carry on the war. Also, changes in the Department's programs help farmers get their wartime job done and necessitate considerable increase in the printing of forms, certificates, blanks, etc., as new activities are undertaken to meet the wartime needs. Our effort is to make sure that the printing funds that are available are put to purposes that will forward the Nation's war program.

I can assure you and your fellow committee members that we shall make strenuous efforts to meet the wartime necessities for the economical and effective use of our paper and printing resources.

Sincerely yours,
CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

JAMES M. LANDIS
OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C. March 1, 1942.
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This Office is well aware of the national shortage of paper and the economies that can be effected by careful planning of all mimeographing and printing work.

One of the most fundamental duties of this Office is to give the general public through State and local defense councils the best possible advice in all matters relating to civilian defense. To that end we have had to reproduce more than 50 different items. Insofar as possible, we have utilized newspaper paper. Our mimeographing is always put on both sides of the sheet.

It may well be that further economies can be effected and to that end I have instructed the staff to be vigilant at all times.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES M. LANDIS,
Director.

JAMES G. ROBINSON
WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C. March 4, 1942.
Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of February 20, requesting that we study our paper and printing needs with a view to effectuating worthwhile savings in our paper and printing bills, as part of the larger program of eliminating all waste and extravagance from our national expenditures, has been referred to this office.

We are continuously studying our paper and printing needs, prescribing ways and means of saving paper and printing, and enforcing adherence to standards and instructions. * * *

Our studies will be continued in this and other directions in order to effect such economies as are possible and practicable under existing conditions.

Your letter is very much appreciated and will serve as an aid to our efforts to effect further savings.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES G. ROBINSON,
Administrative Officer.

Mr. Speaker, among the many other governmental heads who have written to me, evincing a highly cooperative spirit, I would like to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to the following: E. K. Burlew, Acting Secretary of the Interior, who wrote that "the Department of the Interior takes very seriously the problem about which you wrote, and we are doing something effective about it";

Clyde B. Aitchison, Acting Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission; Harry B. Mitchell, president of the United States Civil Service Commission; W. N. Thompson, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury; C. J. Durr, Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission; Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; Oscar B. Ryder, Acting Chairman, United States Tariff Commission; and Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Olds concludes his letter with the heartening assurance that "the Federal Power Commission shares your interest in these matters."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PACE for March 25 and 26, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 27, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a meeting at 10 a. m. on Friday, March 27, 1942, to hear Mr. Elliot E. Simpson, director of the Drexage Rubber Co., of New York, in respect to rubber.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1534. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, with a view to modifying that part of the recommendation which provides that local interests shall defray all costs of the modification or rebuilding of bridges, bulkheads, and other structures and submarine crossings, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 1, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1535. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 31, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Conewago Creek and Davis Brook in Chautauque County and Cattaraugus County, N. Y., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 685); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5496. A bill for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5658. A bill for the relief of James Warren; with amendment (Rept. No. 1947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5854. A bill for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young; with amendment (Rept. No. 1948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5910. A bill for the relief of Randolph and Emma Treiber; with amendment (Rept. No. 1949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5966. A bill for the relief of Louis H. Deaver; without amendment (Rept. No. 1950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6365. A bill for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover; with amendment (Rept. No. 1951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Harry Tousey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 6858. A bill relating to the statues of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 6859. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6860. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 6861. A bill relating to the voting rights of persons in the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 6867 (by request). A bill to amend title 39, United States Code; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 6862. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Thomas P. Prendergast; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6863. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Dowd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 6865. A bill for the relief of Andrew Stenman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 6866. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2612. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk of Los Angeles, Calif., urging the United States Senators from California and the Members of the House of Representatives from California to exert every effort to resist or modify the crippling effect of House bills 6617 and 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2613. By Mr. GILLETTE: A letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Dushore, Pa., favoring the elimination of certain nondefense governmental agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2614. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the Congress of the United States to effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations between United States and Canada so that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and movement of persons and products facilitated for the purpose of promoting harmonious, efficient, and victorious prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2615. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Builders Exchange of San Francisco, Calif., adopted March 16, 1942, for the stepping up of war production; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose Providence doth always make provision for us, if not according to our fancied wants, yet according to our inmost needs: Quicken and quiet the spirit in us for worship and for praise, and, from the sanctuary of Thy holiness, do Thou compose our thoughts and renew our strength. Unclose our inward ear for hearing, and do Thou give to us the earnestness of soul that has no time to waste on anything that furthers not a sense of duty to God and Country, for the establishment of righteous dealing among men and the nations of the world.

We bless Thee for the lives of self-denial all about us, for the experiences which bring to us their lessons, leaving

us chastened and tempered to a wiser spirit, and if there be in our heart today a song of thankfulness, and mingled with the song a prayer of upward aspiration, do Thou in Thy mercy receive the song and answer Thou the prayer according to the D'vine pleasure of Thy will; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 26, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Army was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are holding hearings in Western States on matters pertaining to national defense.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.